

Michigan Part B Annual Performance Report

**As required by 20 U.S.C. 1416
Sec. 616(b)(1) of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* 2004**

Submitted to the
U.S. Department of Education
Office of Special Education Programs
February 1, 2011

(Resubmitted to OSEP on 4/18/11)



Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services

Annual Performance Report Table of Contents

	Page
Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development	3
Indicator 1 Graduation.....	8
Indicator 2 Dropout	18
Indicator 3 Statewide Assessment	27
Indicator 4A Suspension/Expulsion	41
Indicator 4B Suspension/Expulsion by Race/Ethnicity	50
Indicator 5 Educational Environments	55
Indicator 6 Preschool Educational Environments	62
Indicator 7 Preschool Outcomes	63
Indicator 8 Facilitated Parent Involvement.....	71
Indicator 9 Disproportionate Representation—Child with a Disability.....	80
Indicator 10 Disproportionate Representation—Eligibility Categories.....	92
Indicator 11 Child Find	106
Indicator 12 Early Childhood Transition.....	119
Indicator 13 Secondary Transition	128
Indicator 14 Postsecondary Outcomes	135
Indicator 15 Compliance Findings.....	144
Indicator 16 State Complaints	167
Indicator 17 Hearings Adjudicated.....	171
Indicator 18 Resolution Session Agreements.....	176
Indicator 19 Mediation Agreements	180
Indicator 20 Timely and Accurate Data	186
Acronym List	193
Appendix A Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System (CIMS)	195
Appendix B Michigan’s Integrated Improvement Initiatives (MI3)	200
Appendix C Disproportionate Representation Business Rules	203
Appendix D Postsecondary Outcomes Survey.....	208

**Michigan's FFY 2009 Annual Performance Report (APR)
February 2011 Overview**

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE), Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services (OSE-EIS) developed the FFY 2009 (2009-2010) APR in collaboration with the Office of Early Childhood Education and Family Services (ECE&FS) as well as other state agency offices and OSE-EIS grantees. This APR includes a report of Michigan's progress and/or slippage in meeting the state's "measurable and rigorous targets" found in its State Performance Plan (SPP). The current versions of the SPP and APR can be found on the MDE Web site at: www.michigan.gov/ose-eis (select "Annual Performance Report/State Performance Plan" in the left column).

The APR reflects statewide summary data from Michigan's local educational agencies (LEAs) and state agency programs. Michigan's 2009-2010 Educational Entity Master references 848 LEAs:

- 551 traditional school districts
- 240 charter schools, known in Michigan as Public School Academies
- 57 intermediate school districts (ISDs)/educational service agencies (ESAs)

State agency programs include the Michigan School for the Deaf and educational programs operated by Michigan's Departments of Community Health, Corrections, and Human Services. Students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) were enrolled in 834 of these entities.

In this document the term "districts" refers to all LEAs, including traditional school districts, charter schools/public school academies and ISDs/ESAs that provide direct services to students.

Within each indicator, the number of districts included in the calculations varies depending on the data requirements (e.g., not all districts had a preschool program or a secondary program, and some had no students with IEPs).

Process Used to Develop the APRLeadership

The SPP core team membership included the:

- OSE-EIS Director
- OSE-EIS Assistant Director
- OSE-EIS Program Accountability, Performance Reporting and Continuous Improvement and Compliance Supervisors
- ECE&FS Supervisor of Preschool and Early Elementary Programs
- OSE-EIS Information Management, Planning and Reporting Coordinators
- OSE-EIS APR Consultant
- OSE-EIS Data Quality Consultant
- OSE-EIS support staff

The core team provided global direction and oversight during the development of the APR. The team provided advice on the required elements of each indicator

report, which contributed to the accuracy and coherence of the final report. The team also addressed specific issues related to individual SPP indicators.

A work team was created for each SPP indicator. Each team had an indicator lead with data and secretarial support staff. As appropriate, teams included staff from:

- the OSE-EIS
- ECE&FS
- Michigan's Integrated Improvement Initiative (MI3)
- the MDE's Office of Educational Assessment and Accountability (OEAA)
- Michigan's Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI)
- external providers of data services to the OSE-EIS

The indicator teams examined data, data collection strategies, variables that impacted progress and slippage, and improvement activities.

National Guidance and Support

The following national technical assistance centers, networks and organizations provided the MDE with APR-related consultation and/or resources:

- Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS)
- Consortium for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE)
- Data Accountability Center (DAC) (includes the former NCSEAM)
- Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Center
- Education Information Management Advisory Consortium (EIMAC)
- Great Lakes East Comprehensive Center
- National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE)
- National Dissemination Center for Children with Disabilities (NICHCY)
- National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD)
- National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC)
- National Instructional Materials Accessibility Standard (NIMAS) Center for Applied Special Technology (NIMAS-CAST)
- National Implementation Research Network (NIRN)
- National Post-School Outcomes Center (NPSO)
- National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC)
- North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC)
- State Implementation and Scaling-up of Evidence-based Practices (SISEP) Center

National center guidance is evident throughout the APR. Staff turned to the centers for guidance in tasks such as alignment with the NCSEAM's eight general supervision components and revisions to the indicator measurement table.

Stakeholder Involvement

The Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC)¹, multiple core teams, partner organizations and parent networks provided stakeholder input. A description of stakeholder involvement is presented in the Part B SPP Overview (February 2011 Update/Revisions).

¹ Michigan's IDEA mandated special education State Advisory Panel.

Data Systems and Improvements

This year's APR reflects improved data entry, collection, verification and analysis practices. The OSE-EIS collaborated with the following data systems' technical experts to ensure compliance with all data collection requirements:

- The OEAA coordinated statewide student assessment data.
- The CEPI enhanced the Michigan Student Data System (MSDS) to enable districts to verify discipline and child find data in a secure manner consistent with the *Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act* and Michigan's *Identity Theft Protection Act*.
- Interagency Information Systems updated the special education child count system to match the MSDS structure. They also updated the MDE public reporting Web structures in order to support review of the data.
- Public Sector Consultants (PSC) assisted with the development of the public reporting database.
- Wayne State University's (WSU) Center for Urban Studies maintained data portals for local and state views of both disproportionate representation and parent involvement data. The summary district level parent involvement data are now available to the public.
- WSU provided guidance for sampling procedures to assure that data were representative.
- The HighScope Educational Research Foundation supported the collection and analysis of preschool outcomes data.

Monitoring and Reporting

The OSE-EIS continued its implementation of the redesigned Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System (CIMS). Electronic workbooks were issued in September, December and April providing districts information about their systems. Findings of noncompliance were issued based on data reviews and focused monitoring activities through the CIMS.

To ensure timely correction of findings, districts were required to submit corrective action plans within 60 days of findings being issued. The OSE-EIS reviewed and approved each corrective action plan. Districts submitted progress reports per an established calendar and were required to request close-out within the CIMS once all activities were completed. The OSE-EIS verified correction of noncompliance. Verification included correction of each individual case of noncompliance and that the district was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on the review of updated data. Districts were notified of their status within the CIMS. Technical assistance was provided throughout to ensure correction as soon as possible but in no case later than one year, including verification (see Appendix A).

Collaboration among LEAs, ISDs and State Entities

Given federal expectations for increasing alignment between the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (ESEA) and *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA), the OSE-EIS enhanced collaboration and coordination with districts and state agencies. The OSE-EIS continued to expand and improve communication

systems with stakeholders involved in implementing the IDEA and ESEA. For example, regular conference calls and meetings continued with ISD special education directors and monitors. The OSE-EIS, in partnership with organizations such as the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education² and Michigan Pupil Accounting and Attendance Association, provided new director workshops, professional learning workshops and information at general membership meetings and webinars. These efforts resulted in improved general supervision, data system clarity and student outcomes.

Public Reporting

FFY 2008 public reporting on the performance of individual districts on required indicators (Indicator 1-5 and 8-12) was accomplished through:

- Collaboration with stakeholder groups—The OSE-EIS collaborated with groups such as the SEAC and the OSE-EIS Data Advisory Committee regarding the content and format of the public reports.
- Shared leadership with ISDs—The OSE-EIS collaborated with ISD personnel to provide information to district staff and the public.
- District preview of public reporting—The OSE-EIS assured that districts had ample opportunity to preview the data. The preview period enabled districts to prepare communications for their community and plans for improvement.
- Media advisory—The MDE's Office of Communication distributed a media advisory announcing the availability of public reporting.
- General announcement—An MDE Deputy Superintendent sent a memorandum to all superintendents announcing the availability of public reporting. This memorandum was also posted to special education director listservs.
- Posting on the MDE Web site—www.michigan.gov/ose-eis (select "Annual Performance Report/State Performance Plan" in the left column). On May 27, 2010, the OSE-EIS posted individual districts' performance on the required indicators with comparisons to state or federal targets and state performance. The Web site allowed the user to compare one district's performance with other districts on a specific indicator. This posting also provided the opportunity to easily view a district's performance across all indicators.
- Collaboration with parents and community members—The OSE-EIS worked with the Michigan Alliance for Families³ to promote awareness of the public reporting content and process.

FFY 2008 public reporting on Michigan's performance was supplemented by posting the current APR and one-page executive summaries (called "Special Education Facts") for each indicator on the MDE Web site at www.michigan.gov/ose-eis (select "Annual Performance Report/State Performance Plan" in the left column, and then look in the "Indicator Resources" section) and on the Center for Educational Networking Web site www.cenmi.org (click on the link in the left column). The 2009-2010 updates of these documents will be placed on the Web sites following

² Michigan's state affiliate of the National Council of Administrators of Special Education and the Council for Exceptional Children.

³ Michigan's Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) beginning 10/1/2009.

submission of the FFY 2009 APR to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP).

FFY 2009 public reporting on the performance of individual districts on the required indicators will be accomplished through a similar process. The anticipated date for FFY 2009 public reporting posting on the MDE Web site is May 2011.

Michigan's Integrated Improvement Initiatives (MI3)

The MI3 supports the adoption, coordination and implementation of research-based strategies (see Appendix B). An intended MI3 outcome is the "ongoing development of a learning community amongst the MDE funded initiatives, for the purpose of effective installation and implementation, with fidelity, of quality evidence-based interventions."

The data-driven decisions resulting from the APR require fidelity in the implementation of all improvement strategies to sustain results over time. Assuring alignment between SPP/APR activities and the science of implementation remains a focus for MI3 staff and supports integration of essential components of an effective system of general supervision.

Michigan is developing implementation capacity across key constituencies within the education community. The Michigan Implementation Network is an initiative to develop a systematic framework for applying the science of implementation in order to:

- Improve the fidelity of effective practices
- Enhance the sustainability of implementation efforts
- Scale-up successful programs and practices

The overall vision for these efforts is as follows:

To ensure Michigan students receive the highest quality instruction, the vision is to create sustainable infrastructures to enhance existing network(s) for implementation of effective practices across all educational settings. An implementation network supports the necessary conditions and resources to coordinate statewide capacity for local implementation fidelity of policy changes and effective practices.

Michigan's Determination Status

Michigan received a "Meets Requirements" Determination status for FFY 2008. Each of the OSEP questions/concerns in the June 2010 Response Table to Michigan's FFY 2008 APR submission has been addressed at the end of the associated indicator section of the FFY 2009 APR.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**Overview of Indicator 1 (Graduation) Report Development:**

1. See General Overview pages 3-7.
2. In March 2009 the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) revised the indicator language and measurement methodology to align with the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (ESEA).
3. The OSEP revisions necessitated the establishment of a new baseline for this indicator using the new cohort calculation methodology.
4. The OSEP revisions also included a one-year data lag for this indicator. Therefore 2008-2009 data is reported in this FFY 2009 APR submission.
5. Michigan school districts determine graduation requirements locally, and the number and type of credits required varies widely. For 2009 graduates, the only state graduation requirement was one-half credit in civics.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE⁴/Graduation

(Results Indicator)

Indicator 1: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement: States must report using the graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the ESEA.

⁴ Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
Calculations using Leaver Graduation Rate Methodology			
2004	69.7%		
2005		80.0%	70.6%
2006		80.0%	69.0%
2007		80.0%	69.3%
Calculations using Cohort Four-Year Graduation Rate Methodology and using OSEP's Prescribed One Year Data Lag			
2008 (2007-2008 data)	58.0%	80.0%	58.0%
2009 (2008-2009 data)		80.0%	57.3%*
[(# of youth with IEPs who entered ninth grade in 2005-2006 and received a regular diploma within four years) divided by the (total # of youth with IEPs in the cohort)] times 100. $*[9,801 \div 17,097] \times 100$			

Source: Single Record Student Database (SRSD), Graduation and Dropout (GAD) Review and Comment Application

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed

Timelines	Activities	Status
PROVIDE TRAINING/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT		
2006-2011	1. Implement evidence-based practices to improve student outcomes; i.e., graduation and postsecondary outcomes.	<p>Michigan's Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative (MiBLSi): The 45 MiBLSi middle schools received professional development in three areas: fidelity of implementation, literacy attainment and the adoption of positive behavior supports. MiBLSi has supported middle school student readiness to enter high school by contributing to the increase of developmentally appropriate student literacy rates. These rates were measured by the percent of students achieving benchmark goals on assessments.</p> <p>The Michigan Transition Outcomes Project (MI-TOP):</p>

Timelines	Activities	Status
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Received technical assistance from the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC), National Post-School Outcomes (NPSO) Center, National Dropout Prevention Center-Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD) and Regional Resource Centers regarding the indicators of graduation, dropout, secondary transition and postsecondary outcomes. Convened three workshops for secondary transition and other special education personnel for the purpose of disseminating best practices leading to graduation and successful transition to postsecondary roles. The workshops used the North Central Regional Resource Center's (NCRRC) <i>IT Kit</i> as a resource for participants to analyze connections among the indicators of graduation, dropout, secondary transition and postsecondary outcomes. Provided an updated online learning module, technical assistance, coaching and professional development to achieve high levels of compliance and improved supports for students with IEPs. These transition activities are intended to promote graduation with a regular high school diploma.
2008-2011	2. Implement the Reaching and Teaching Struggling Learners initiative as a strategy to increase graduation and decrease dropout rates.	<p>The Reaching and Teaching Struggling Learners (RTSL) initiative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported cohort 1 (15 middle and high school building) teams in their review of policies, practices and procedures regarding graduation. Applied a learning community model for the building teams to achieve results. Utilized the practices recommended by the following organizations to support building teams: International Center for Leadership in Education (ICLE) regarding high school redesign, Great Lakes East Comprehensive Center's dropout research, NCRRC's Guidance about Response to Intervention and NDPC-SD's value for the Early Warning Signs risk calculator. Shared the National High School Center's (NHSC) Early Warning Sign tool with cohort 2

Timelines	Activities	Status
		<p>teams as a data analysis tool to predict graduation. In addition, the RTSL Web site provided a data probe questionnaire, produced for Georgia by the NDPC-SD, to assist schools in assessing their building's capacity to increase graduation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommended the use of the Early Warning Signs tool as a cornerstone of <i>Michigan's Superintendent's Dropout Challenge</i>. In addition, the Title II, Part D data warehouse grant actively engaged districts to explore the Early Warning Signs tool's utility in their data-driven decision making. One thousand one hundred elementary, middle and high school buildings participated in the challenge and were provided with the Early Warning Signs tool. NHSC's tool and webinars were posted on MDE's Dropout Challenge Web page for all stakeholders to use. Assisted buildings in their review of existing dropout prevention strategies as compared to the NDPC's <i>15 Effective Strategies for Dropout Prevention</i>. Improved dropout rates. As reported in 2009, of the ten high schools in RTSL, eight schools decreased their dropout rates for all students and for students with IEPs. The improved dropout rates should result in higher graduation rates as a result of this initiative. <p>The Regional Educational Laboratory (REL) Midwest developed student, staff and administrator surveys to evaluate the initiative. The surveys were used with cohort 1 and 2 building teams.</p>
2009-2011	3. Convene Michigan Symposium on Model High Schools.	Rather than host another Michigan Symposium, MI-TOP and RTSL provided schools with more focused professional development from the ICLE, sponsor of the Model Schools symposiums.
2009-2011	4. Scale up MiBLSi at the secondary level.	Forty-five middle schools actively participated in the MiBLSi during the 2009-2010 school year. This is an integrated behavior and reading model. An annual High School Summit has been held for the last two years. One hundred seventy people representing 68 school buildings, agencies and ISDs from across the state attended. Thirty-six

Timelines	Activities	Status
		high schools have agreed to form a consortium for ongoing collaboration in the areas of behavior and academic achievement.
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2006-2011	5. Embed into Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System Redesign (CIMS-2) a process for districts to review and analyze graduation data and conduct a root cause analysis.	<p>The CIMS integrated the graduation, dropout, secondary transition and postsecondary outcomes indicators into the electronic workbook. MI-TOP provided technical assistance to transition coordinators and other special education personnel regarding attaining compliance and results.</p> <p>Within CIMS, graduation and dropout indicator data sources were provided including their calculations. Probe questions reflected early warning signs, comparisons between general and special education data, and probes regarding educational environments.</p>
2009-2010	6. Convene a referent group to reset graduation targets to be reported in the 2010 SPP/APR, because of the new graduation requirements and the new National Governors Association (NGA) cohort calculation.	The OSEP's March 2009 Indicator Measurement Table revision specified that graduation targets should be the same as the targets under Title I of the ESEA. Therefore, a referent group to set new targets was not needed.
IMPROVE COLLABORATION/COORDINATION		
2005-2011	7. Continue collaboration with the National Dropout Prevention Center (NDPC). Receive technical assistance from the NDPC.	<p>MI-TOP staff participated in the NSTTAC and NPSO institutes to learn how to embed the graduation, dropout, secondary transition and postsecondary outcomes indicators into their technical assistance.</p> <p>MI-TOP staff participated in the NSTTAC follow-up sessions and scheduled webinar/conference calls. MI-TOP conference participants received the probe questions.</p> <p>RTSL staff attended NDPC's November Institute to learn to use Early Warning Sign research and</p>

Timelines	Activities	Status
		tools. NDPC-SD's data probe questions were used with RTSL teams, school improvement staff, and planner monitors working with CIMS.
2008-2011	8. Initiate collaborative work with the Office of School Improvement (OSI) and key education stakeholders to integrate special education practices developed for students receiving special education services known to support school completion into common educational practice across the state.	<p>In June 2009 the OSI (now known as the Office of Educational Improvement and Innovation [OEII]) collaborated with the OSE-EIS to use <i>American Recovery and Reinvestment Act</i> funds to create early warning sign reports. These reports will be collected and reflected through the regional data warehouses. These reports will assist special education decision makers in their selection and implementation of interventions that are known to improve graduation rates for students with disabilities.</p> <p>OEII and RTSL staff presented Dropout Challenge resources at two OEII statewide conferences. With Title II, Part D funds, OEII, Michigan's Integrated Improvement Initiatives (MI3)/OSE-EIS, Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals, and Great Lakes East provided technical assistance for the creation of <i>Graduation Town</i>, an online learning community forum to support state level efforts to increase graduation and decrease dropout rates.</p>
2008-2011	9. Develop and implement a more integrated set of General Supervision activities across: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The general supervision SPP indicators • MI3 • Michigan's emerging work with the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring General Supervision Framework 	Data-based decision making was integrated into the CIMS, MI3, and State Implementation and Scaling-up of Evidence-based Practices. These systems of support helped districts to improve their performance on compliance and results indicators.

Timelines	Activities	Status
2008-2011	10. Work with intradepartmental partners to create consistency in student planning processes.	<p>The OSE-EIS was represented on work groups which developed the compliance requirements of the secondary transition indicator, the use of a personal curriculum; the CIMS probe questions, the MI-TOP emphasis on the indicators of graduation, dropout, secondary transition and postsecondary outcomes and the <i>Transition Planning Made Easier</i> module.</p> <p>MI3/OSE-EIS worked with the Department of Energy, Labor and Economic Growth, Department of Human Services, Department of Community Health, and Michigan's Children to use the Early Warning Signs as a cornerstone for the Shared Youth Vision group. A pilot conference was held to explore the school/community partnership's use of the Early Warning Signs.</p>
CLARIFY/EXAMINE/DEVELOP POLICIES AND PROCEDURES		
2008-2011	11. Implement standards-based IEP policies and procedures.	<p>The new state IEP which is standards-based addresses academic standards and assists in the planning process so that students with IEPs are more likely to achieve at high levels, graduate, and likely to be less vulnerable to dropping out. Michigan implemented the state IEP with companion "Quick Guides".</p>
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2005-2011	12. Continue to disseminate LEA data reports on graduation rates by disability and ethnicity.	<p>The Center for Educational Performance and Information continued to produce Graduation Cohort Reports that disaggregate data, including graduation rates by subgroup such as disability and race/ethnicity.</p>
2008-2011	13. Implement a technical assistance tool that will facilitate districts' analysis of relationships between results and compliance measures.	<p>RTSL and MI-TOP staff developed and updated compliance and results indicator probe questions (graduation, dropout, secondary transition and postsecondary outcomes) for the CIMS electronic workbook. After review by local Results and Analysis Process Teams, results transmittals were provided to school improvement teams for consideration in the Local Educational Agency Planning Cycle.</p> <p>MI-TOP used <i>IT Kit</i> activities with districts to analyze these indicators' data. This work aligned</p>

Timelines	Activities	Status
		with the CIMS probe questions.
2009-2011	14. Develop a guidance document regarding use of the fifth year of high school to support attainment of a regular diploma by students with disabilities. The document will include information that this federally approved option will not affect Adequate Yearly Progress status.	The draft guidance document includes information regarding the personal curriculum, the fifth year of high school, and adequate yearly progress. Other issues may need to be addressed before the document's release in 2011.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2009:

Michigan did not meet its FFY 2009 graduation rate target of 80 percent and slipped slightly below the FFY 2008 baseline rate of 58 percent. The four-year cohort graduation rate for FFY 2009 was 57.3 percent.

Note that the FFY 2008 (2007-2008) cohort five-year graduation rate was 65.1 percent. It appears that the extra year provides students with disabilities important additional opportunities to meet graduation requirements.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2009

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target	Justification
2010 (2010-2011)	80 percent of youth with IEPs in Michigan graduating from high school with a regular diploma.	When developing the original SPP, states were required to set their final year target higher than their first year target. Since then, the OSEP's March 2009 Indicator Measurement Table revision specified that graduation targets should be the same as the targets under Title I of the ESEA. Michigan's final year target was revised to 80 percent.

Timelines	New and Revised Activities	Justification
2009-2011	<i>Deletion of Activity #3:</i> Convene Michigan Symposium on Model High Schools.	Rather than host another Michigan Symposium, MI-TOP and RTSL provided schools with more focused professional development from the ICLE, sponsor of the Model Schools symposiums.
2009-2011	<i>Deletion of Activity #6:</i> Convene a referent group to reset graduation targets to be reported in the 2010 SPP/APR, because of the new graduation requirements and the new NGA cohort calculation.	The OSEP's March 2009 Indicator Measurement Table revision specifies that graduation targets must align with the general state graduation target. Therefore, a referent group to set new targets was not needed.

Michigan Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 58 percent. Because the State's actual target data for this indicator are from the same year as the data reported in the State's FFY 2007 APR and the State changed the way the data were reported for this indicator, OSEP cannot comment on whether there is progress or slippage. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 80 percent.</p> <p>The State reported the required graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the ESEA. This means that the State submitted the most recent graduation data that the State reported to the Department as part of its Consolidated</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011.</p>	<p>None required per FFY 2008 Response Table.</p>

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>State Performance Report. In its APR submitted February 1, 2010, the State reported FFY 2007 data for this indicator.</p> <p>The State provided a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet to graduate with a regular diploma.</p>		

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009 (2008-2009)**Overview of Indicator 2 (Dropout) Report Development:**

1. See General Overview pages 3-7.
2. In March 2009 the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) revised the indicator language and measurement methodology to align with the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (ESEA). The annual event dropout rate now used for this indicator is the rate reported for all Michigan students and subgroups in Michigan's Consolidated State Performance Report. Michigan's State Performance Plan (SPP) contains a detailed description of how the event dropout rate is calculated. See pages 15-16 of the SPP.
3. The OSE-EIS established a new baseline for this indicator in FFY 2008 to align with the new methodology.
4. The OSEP revisions also included a one-year data lag for this indicator. Therefore, 2008-2009 data are reported in this FFY 2009 APR submission.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE⁵/Dropout

(Results Indicator)

Indicator 2: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement: States must report using the dropout data used in the ESEA graduation rate calculation and follow the timeline established by the Department under the ESEA.

⁵ Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
Calculations using <i>Leaver Dropout Rate Methodology</i>			
2004	25.5%		
2005		13.0%	25.2%
2006		11.5%	28.9%
2007		10.0%	28.1%
Calculation using <i>Consolidated State Performance Report Event Dropout Rate Methodology⁶</i> , and using <i>OSEP's Prescribed One Year Data Lag</i>			
2008 (2007-2008 data)	7.6%	10.0%	7.6%
2009 (2008-2009 data)		9.5%	7.2%*
[(# of youth with IEPs who dropped out of high school in one year) divided by the (# of youth with IEPs who were enrolled in grades 9-12 in the same year)] times 100. This includes students ages 14-21 who were in ungraded programs and matched by age to grades 9-12. $*[5,144 \div 71,772] \times 100$			

Source: Single Record Student Database (SRSD), Graduation and Dropout (GAD) Review and Comment Application

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed

Timelines	Activities	Status
PROVIDE TRAINING/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT		
2006-2011	1. Develop and implement best practices leading to graduation and successful transition to postsecondary roles.	Michigan's Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative (MiBLSi): The MiBLSi middle schools received professional development in three areas: fidelity of implementation, literacy attainment and adoption of positive behavior supports. MiBLSi high schools received professional development in both behavioral supports and fidelity of implementation and behavioral supports. Middle schools and high schools reported a decrease in office disciplinary referrals. The Michigan Transition Outcomes Project (MI-TOP): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Received technical assistance from the National

⁶ The new methodology makes the two rates not comparable.

Timelines	Activities	Status
		<p>Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC), National Post-School Outcomes (NPSO) Center, National Dropout Prevention Center-Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD) and Regional Resource Centers regarding the indicators of graduation, dropout, secondary transition and postsecondary outcomes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convened three workshops for secondary transition and other special education personnel for the purpose of disseminating best practices leading to graduation and successful transition to postsecondary roles. The workshops used the North Central Regional Resource Center's (NCRRC) <i>IT Kit</i> as a resource for participants to analyze connections among the indicators of graduation, dropout, secondary transition and postsecondary outcomes. • Provided an updated online learning module, technical assistance, coaching and professional development to achieve high levels of compliance and improved supports for students with IEPs. These transition activities contributed to a decrease in the dropout rate.
2008-2011	2. Implement the Reaching and Teaching Struggling Learners (RTSL) initiative as a strategy to increase graduation and decrease dropout rates.	<p>The RTSL initiative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported cohort 1 (15 middle and high school building) teams in their review of policies, practices and procedures regarding graduation and dropout. • Applied a learning community model for the building teams to achieve results. • Utilized the practices recommended by the following organizations to support building teams: International Center for Leadership in Education (ICLE) regarding high school redesign, Great Lakes East Comprehensive Center's dropout research, Institute of Education Sciences' (IES) Practice Guide for Dropout Prevention and NDPC-SD's value for the Early Warning Signs risk calculator. • Shared the National High School Center's (NHSC) Early Warning Sign tool with cohort 2 teams as a data analysis tool to predict graduation and dropout. In addition, the RTSL Web site provided a data probe questionnaire, produced for Georgia by the NDPC-SD, to assist

Timelines	Activities	Status
		<p>schools in assessing their building's capacity to reduce dropout.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommended the use of the Early Warning Signs tool as a cornerstone of the Michigan's <i>Superintendent's Dropout Challenge</i>. In addition, the Title II, Part D data warehouse grant actively engaged districts to explore the Early Warning Signs tool's utility in their data-driven decision making. One thousand one hundred elementary, middle and high school buildings participated in the challenge and were provided with the Early Warning Signs tool. NHSC's tool and webinars were posted on MDE's Dropout Challenge Web page for all stakeholders to use. Assisted buildings in their review of existing dropout prevention strategies as compared to the NDPC's <i>15 Effective Strategies for Dropout Prevention</i>. Improved dropout rates. As reported in 2009, of the ten high schools in RTSL, eight schools decreased their dropout rates for all students and for students with IEPs. <p>The Regional Educational Laboratory (REL) Midwest developed student, staff and administrators surveys to evaluate the initiative. The surveys were used with cohort 1 and 2 building teams.</p>
2009-2011	3. Convene Michigan Symposium on Model High Schools.	Rather than host another Michigan Symposium, MI-TOP and RTSL provided schools with more focused professional development from the ICLE, sponsor of the Model Schools symposiums.
2009-2011	4. Fully implement and scale up MiBLSi at the secondary level.	Forty-five middle schools actively participated in the MiBLSi during the 2009-2010 school year. This is an integrated behavior and reading model. An annual High School Summit has been held for the last two years. One hundred seventy people representing 68 school buildings, agencies and ISDs from across the state attended. Thirty-six high schools have agreed to form a consortium for ongoing collaboration in the areas of behavior and academic achievement.
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		

Timelines	Activities	Status
2006-2011	5. Embed into Continuous Improvement Monitoring System-Cycle 2 (CIMS-2) a process for LEAs to review and analyze graduation data and conduct a root cause analysis.	<p>The CIMS integrated the graduation, dropout, secondary transition and postsecondary outcomes indicators into the electronic workbook. MI-TOP provided technical assistance to transition coordinators and other special education personnel regarding attaining compliance and results.</p> <p>Within CIMS, graduation and dropout indicator data sources were provided including their calculations. Probe questions reflected early warning signs, comparisons between general and special education data, and probes related to educational environments.</p>
IMPROVE COLLABORATION/COORDINATION		
2006-2011	6. Continue collaboration with the National Dropout Prevention Center (NDPC). Receive technical assistance from the NDPC.	<p>MI-TOP staff participated in the NSTTAC and NPSO institutes to learn how to embed the indicators of graduation, dropout, secondary transition and postsecondary outcomes into their technical assistance.</p> <p>MI-TOP staff participated in the NSTTAC follow-up sessions, and scheduled webinar/conference calls. MI-TOP conference participants received the probe questions.</p> <p>RTSL staff attended NDPC's November Institute to learn to use Early Warning Sign research and tools. NDPC-SD's data probe questions were used with RTSL teams, school improvement staff, and planner monitors working with CIMS.</p>
2006-2011	7. Develop strategic initiatives through the Parent Involvement grant that focus on reducing dropout rates.	<p>The following activities helped educators and parents explore the power of parent involvement in Michigan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services (OSE-EIS) included the Michigan Alliance for Families⁷ in its planning for a parent guide for the Michigan Merit Curriculum and the personal curriculum options. • Special education stakeholders explored how to increase K-12 success by conducting a learning opportunity entitled Facilitated Conversations, with the Michigan Alliance for Families, in order to assist administrators and parent mentors with

⁷ Michigan's Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) beginning 10/1/2009.

Timelines	Activities	Status
		<p>collaboration. Facilitated Conversations used National Association of State Directors of Special Education's (NASDSE) community of practice guide, <i>New Eyes</i>. Wayne State University (WSU) evaluated whether this work strengthened relationships between parents and educators in northwestern Michigan and identified many positive results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four RTSL building teams adopted parent involvement practices to support struggling learners. Parents ran fundraisers for literacy assessments and participated in home visits and school board meetings to demonstrate their school support. • During a professional development two day event, Michigan's Integrated Improvement Initiatives (MI3) explored how their improvement work, including dropout prevention, connected to parent involvement as reflected in survey results based on the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) ladder.
2008-2011	8. Work with intra-departmental partners to create consistency in student planning processes.	<p>The OSE-EIS was represented on work groups which developed the compliance requirements of the secondary transition indicator, the use of a personal curriculum; the CIMS probe questions, the MI-TOP emphasis on the indicators of graduation, dropout, secondary transition and postsecondary outcomes and the <i>Transition Planning Made Easier</i> module.</p> <p>MI3/OSE-EIS worked with Department of Energy, Labor and Economic Growth, Department of Human Services, Department of Community Health, and Michigan's Children to use the Early Warning Signs as a cornerstone for the Shared Youth Vision group. A pilot conference was held to explore school/community partnership use of the Early Warning Signs.</p>
2008-2011	9. Develop and implement a more integrated set of General Supervision activities across: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The general 	<p>Data-based decision making was integrated into the CIMS, MI3, and State Implementation and Scaling-up of Evidence-based Practices. These systems of support helped districts to improve their performance on compliance and results indicators.</p>

Timelines	Activities	Status
	supervision SPP indicators <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MI3 Michigan's emerging work with the NCSEAM General Supervision Framework 	
CLARIFY/EXAMINE/DEVELOP POLICIES AND PROCEDURES		
2008-2011	10. Implement standards-based IEP policies and procedures.	The new state IEP, which is standards-based, addresses academic standards and assists in the planning process so that students with IEPs are more likely to achieve at high levels, graduate, and likely to be less vulnerable to dropping out. Michigan implemented the state IEP with companion "Quick Guides".
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2005-2011	11. Continue to disseminate LEA data reports on dropout rates by disability and ethnicity.	The Center for Educational Performance and Information continued to produce public Dropout Cohort Reports that disaggregate data, including dropout rates by subgroup such as disability and race/ethnicity. However, these rates do not align with the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) event rates and methodology required for the APR.
2008-2011	12. Implement a technical assistance tool that will facilitate districts' analysis of relationships between results and compliance measures.	RTSL and MI-TOP staff developed and updated compliance and results indicator probe questions (graduation, dropout, secondary transition and postsecondary outcomes) for the CIMS electronic workbook. After review by local Results and Analysis Process Teams, results transmittals were provided to school improvement teams for consideration in the Local Educational Agency Planning Cycle. MI-TOP used <i>IT Kit</i> activities with districts to analyze these indicators' data. This work aligned with the CIMS probe questions.
2009-2011	13. Develop a guidance document regarding use of the fifth year of high school to	The draft guidance document includes information regarding personal curriculum, the fifth year of high school, and adequate yearly progress. Other issues may need to be addressed before the document's release in 2011.

Timelines	Activities	Status
	support the attainment of a regular diploma. The document will include information that this federally approved option will not affect Adequate Yearly Progress status.	
2009-2011	14. Increase participation in the components of Michigan's <i>Superintendent's Dropout Challenge</i> .	One thousand one hundred schools joined the challenge. High schools in the challenge indicated their commitment on the MDE's Dropout Challenge Web page, participated in Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals' webinar on the early warning signs, and attended MDE conferences to increase understanding of the IES practice guide on dropout prevention.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2009:

Michigan met its FFY 2009 dropout target of 9.5 percent or less for students with disabilities. The dropout event rate, 7.2 percent, is based on a one-year snapshot of students with disabilities who dropped out during the 2008-2009 school year. The dropout event rate improved by 0.4 percent between FFY 2008 and FFY 2009.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2009

Timelines	New and Revised Activities	Justification
2009-2011	<i>Deletion of Activity #3:</i> Convene Michigan Symposium on Model High Schools.	Rather than host another Michigan Symposium, MI-TOP and RTSL provided schools with more focused professional development from the ICLE, sponsor of the Model Schools symposiums.

Michigan Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 7.6 percent. Because the State's actual target data for this indicator are from the same year as the data reported in the State's FFY 2007 APR and the State changed the way the data were reported for this indicator, OSEP cannot comment on whether there is progress or slippage. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 10 percent.</p> <p>The State reported the required dropout rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the ESEA. This means that the State submitted the most recent dropout data that the State reported to the Department as part of its CSPR. In its APR submitted February 1, 2010, the State reported FFY 2007 data for this indicator.</p> <p>The State provided a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>	<p>None required per FFY 2008 Response Table</p>

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**Overview of Indicator 3 (Statewide Assessment) Report Development:**

1. See General Overview pages 3-7.
2. Michigan's Educational Assessment System is comprised of the following state assessments: the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) for students in grades 3-8, the Michigan Merit Examination (MME) for students in grade 11, Michigan's alternate assessment program based on alternate achievement standards (MI-Access), Michigan's alternate assessment based on modified achievement standards (MEAP-Access), and the English Language Proficiency Assessment (ELPA). Michigan's English language arts and mathematics assessments have received approval through the U.S. Department of Education (USED) peer review process. MEAP-Access is undergoing the peer review process.
3. District Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP): A school district is considered to have made AYP if the district makes AYP in both reading and mathematics at one of the three grade ranges (elementary, middle or high school).
4. Michigan's assessment results are available to the public at:
http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-22709_25058---,00.html

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE⁸/Statewide Assessment

(Results Indicator)

Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) on statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

⁸ Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment.

Measurement:

- A. AYP percent = $\left[\left(\frac{\text{\# of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup}}{\text{total \# of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size}} \right) \right] \times 100$.
- B. Participation rate percent = $\left[\left(\frac{\text{\# of children with IEPs participating in the assessment}}{\text{total \# of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window, calculated separately for reading and math}} \right) \right]$. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.
- C. Proficiency rate percent = $\left(\left[\left(\frac{\text{\# of children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year scoring at or above proficient}}{\text{total \# of children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year, calculated separately for reading and math}} \right) \right] \right)$.

Table 1: A — Districts Meeting AYP Objectives for Disability Subgroup

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2005	100%		
2006		88.0%	92.7%
2007		91.0%	98.5%
2008		94.0%	99.4%
2009		97.0%	99.7%*
Percent = $\left[\left(\frac{\text{\# of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup}}{\text{total \# of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size}} \right) \right] \times 100$.			
*[390 ÷ 391] x 100			

Source: Michigan Department of Education (MDE)/Office of Educational Assessment and Accountability (OEAA)

Table 2: B - Participation — Participation of children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards; and alternate assessment against modified achievement standards⁹.

Participation Rate	Grade 3		Grade 4		Grade 5		Grade 6		Grade 7		Grade 8		Grade 11	
	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math
a. # of Children with IEPs in assessed grades ^{10,11}	16,340	16,318	17,421	17,384	17,711	17,668	17,377	17,355	17,234	17,210	16,983	16,979	13,796	13,792
b. # and % of Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	9,727 59.5%	8,468 51.9%	9,697 55.7%	8,085 46.5%	9,402 53.1%	7,288 41.2%	9,497 54.7%	7,124 41.1%	9,587 55.6%	6,967 40.5%	9,448 55.6%	7,074 41.7%	3,396 24.6%	2,542 18.4%
c. # and % of Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	2,593 15.9%	4,356 26.7%	3,255 18.7%	5,443 31.3%	3,685 20.8%	6,261 35.4%	3,377 19.4%	5,986 35.5%	3,222 18.7%	6,016 35.0%	3,139 18.5%	5,560 32.8%	6,660 48.3%	7,382 53.5%
d. # and % of Children with IEPs in alt. assessment against grade level standards	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
e. # and % of Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards	2,660 16.3%	2,399 14.7%	2,855 16.4%	2,603 15.0%	2,943 16.6%	2,742 15.5%	2,871 16.5%	2,735 15.8%	2,815 16.3%	2,713 15.8%	2,774 16.3%	2,755 16.2%	2,777 20.1%	2,770 20.1%
f. # and % of Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against modified achievement standards	1,087 6.7%	818 5.0%	1,352 7.8%	987 5.7%	1,398 7.9%	1,099 6.2%	1,333 7.7%	1,182 6.8%	1,341 7.8%	1,203 7.0%	1,192 7.0%	1,080 6.4%	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Total # and Overall Participation Rate ¹²	16,072 98.4%	16,041 98.3%	17,159 98.5%	17,118 98.5%	17,430 98.4%	17,390 98.4%	17,079 98.2%	17,027 98.1%	16,967 98.5%	16,899 98.2%	16,553 97.5%	16,469 97.0%	12,833 93.0%	12,694 92.0%

Source: MDE/OEAA

⁹ Participation data does not include Limited English Proficiency students who, at the time of testing, were in the United States for less than 10 months and participated in the English Language Proficiency Assessment in place of the regular reading assessment.

¹⁰ Students included in a, but not b-f above are the result of Michigan's enrollment data being gathered on 9/23/09 for fall assessments, and 02/10/10 for spring assessments, with the assessment windows occurring from 10/12/09-11/20/09 (grades 3-8) and 2/15/10-3/31/10 (grade 11). In addition, Michigan does not count students with invalid scores as assessed.

¹¹ The enrollment numbers differ slightly within a grade due to student mobility as Michigan assesses mathematics and ELA during different weeks in the assessment window.

¹² The bottom row represents the total numbers and rates of children with IEPs who participated in state assessment.

Table 3: B – Participation of Children with IEPs

Measurable and Rigorous Targets							
FFY	Reading						
	Grade						
	3	4	5	6	7	8	11
2005 Target	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%
2005 Actual	98.1%	98.6%	99.1%	97.0%	98.1%	97.5%	91.3%
2006 Target	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%
2006 Actual	99.3%	99.7%	99.3%	99.3%	99.2%	98.9%	85.1%
2007 Target	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%
2007 Actual	99.1%	98.8%	99.2%	99.7%	98.3%	98.3%	90.5%
2008 Target	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%
2008 Actual	98.5%	98.5%	98.9%	98.5%	98.3%	97.6%	92.7%
2009 Target	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%
2009 Actual	98.4%	98.5%	98.4%	98.2%	98.5%	97.5%	93.0%
2009 Status	Target met	Target met	Target met	Target met	Target met	Target met	Target not met
Measurable and Rigorous Targets							
FFY	Mathematics						
	Grade						
	3	4	5	6	7	8	11
2005 Target	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%
2005 Actual	98.4%	98.9%	99.2%	97.5%	98.9%	98.1%	94.1%
2006 Target	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%
2006 Actual	99.2%	99.6%	99.3%	99.1%	99.0%	98.8%	91.1%
2007 Target	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%
2007 Actual	99.4%	99.1%	99.8%	98.7%	98.7%	98.8%	91.8%
2008 Target	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%
2008 Actual	99.0%	98.9%	99.4%	99.1%	99.0%	98.4%	92.5%
2009 Target	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%
2009 Actual	98.3%	98.5%	98.4%	98.1%	98.2%	97.0%	92.0%
2009 Status	Target met	Target met	Target met	Target met	Target met	Target met	Target not met

Source: MDE/OEAA

Summary Information FFY 2009 Participation**Students with IEPs Participating in State Reading Assessment**

- Number of students with IEPs enrolled in tested grade levels = 116,862
- Number of students with IEPs participating = 114,093
- Percentage of students with IEPs participating = 97.6 percent

Students with IEPs Participating in State Mathematics Assessment

- Number of students with IEPs enrolled in tested grade levels = 116,706
- Number of students with IEPs participating = 113,368
- Percentage of students with IEPs participating = 97.1 percent

Table 4: C — Proficiency of children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.

Proficiency Rate	Grade 3		Grade 4		Grade 5		Grade 6		Grade 7		Grade 8		Grade 11	
	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math
a. Number of Children with IEPs in assessed grades	16,340	16,318	17,421	17,384	17,711	17,668	17,377	17,355	17,234	17,210	16,983	16,979	13,796	13,792
Total # of Participants ¹³	16,129	16,055	17,216	17,136	17,465	17,399	17,133	17,031	17,001	16,918	16,582	16,480	13,221	13,199
b. # and % of Children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations ¹⁴	7,352 45.5%	7,712 48.0%	6,181 35.9%	6,867 40.1%	5,872 33.6%	4,599 26.4%	5,859 34.2%	4,134 24.3%	4,687 27.6%	3,901 23.1%	4,707 28.4%	2,592 15.6%	794 6.0%	331 2.5%
c. # and % of Children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with accommodations	1,392 8.6%	3,553 22.1%	1,335 7.8%	3,957 23.1%	1,666 9.5%	2,558 14.7%	1,854 10.8%	2,723 16.0%	1,461 8.6%	2,752 16.3%	1,415 8.5%	1,406 8.5%	1,581 12.0%	776 5.9%
d. # and % of Children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured by the alternate assessment against grade level standards	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
e. # and % of Children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured against alternate achievement standards	2,115 13.1%	1,867 11.6%	2,122 12.3%	2,166 12.6%	2,275 13.0%	1,983 11.4%	2,407 14.1%	2,155 12.7%	2,380 14.0%	1,939 11.5%	2,372 14.3%	2,155 13.0%	2,341 17.7%	2,002 15.2%
f. # and % of Children with IEPs in assessed grades who are proficient or above as measured against modified achievement standards	340 2.1%	492 3.1%	686 4.0%	721 4.2%	699 4.0%	688 4.0%	644 3.8%	564 3.3%	698 4.1%	568 3.4%	691 4.2%	404 2.4%	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Total # and Overall Proficiency Rate for Children with IEPs	11,199 69.4%	13,624 84.9%	10,324 60.0%	13,711 80.0%	10,512 60.2%	9,828 56.5%	10,764 62.8%	9,576 56.2%	9,226 54.3%	9,160 54.1%	9,185 55.4%	6,557 39.5%	4,716 35.7%	3,109 23.6%

¹³ Michigan added this row and used it as the denominator when the "Total # and Overall Proficiency Rate for Children with IEPs" was calculated. The bottom row is based on the # of students with disabilities participating in the state regular or alternate assessments, not the total numbers of students with IEPs in a given grade. This was approved by the OSEP state contact and aligns with Michigan's approved Accountability Workbook.

¹⁴ Students included in a, but not b-e above are the result of Michigan's enrollment data being gathered on 9/23/09 for fall assessments and 02/10/10 for spring assessments, with the assessment windows occurring from 10/12/09-11/20/09 (grades 3-8) and 2/15/10-3/31/10 (grade 11). In addition, Michigan does not count students with invalid scores as assessed.

Table 5: C – Proficiency of Children with IEPs

Measurable and Rigorous Targets - Reading							
FFY	Grade						
	3	4	5	6	7	8	11
2005 Target	50.0%	48.0%	46.0%	45.0%	43.0%	41.0%	52.0%
2005 Actual	53.3%	46.8%	45.0%	43.3%	38.4%	35.3%	25.1%
2006 Target	50.0%	48.0%	46.0%	45.0%	43.0%	41.0%	52.0%
2006 Actual	56.1%	51.3%	49.0%	48.4%	43.2%	39.1%	25.5%
2007 Target	60.0%	59.0%	57.0%	56.0%	54.0%	53.0%	61.0%
2007 Actual	57.9%	50.5%	48.9%	49.0%	42.1%	43.6%	24.5%
2008 Target	60.0%	59.0%	57.0%	56.0%	54.0%	53.0%	61.0%
2008 Actual	60.0%	50.6%	48.8%	49.0%	48.8%	43.6%	28.0%
2009 Target	70.0%	69.0%	68.0%	67.0%	66.0%	65.0%	71.0%
2009 Actual	69.4%	60.0%	60.2%	62.8%	54.3%	55.4%	35.7%
2009 Status	Target not met	Target not met	Target not met	Target not met	Target not met	Target not met	Target not met
2009 Status	Targets not met at any grade levels for the 2009-2010 School Year						
Measurable and Rigorous Targets – Mathematics							
FFY	Grade						
	3	4	5	6	7	8	11
2005 Target	59.0%	56.0%	53.0%	50.0%	46.0%	43.0%	44.0%
2005 Actual	68.2%	59.0%	48.5%	35.3%	29.2%	31.9%	21.7%
2006 Target	59.0%	56.0%	53.0%	50.0%	46.0%	43.0%	44.0%
2006 Actual	74.1%	66.9%	50.9%	42.1%	35.2%	39.5%	22.1%
2007 Target	67.0%	65.0%	62.0%	60.0%	57.0%	54.0%	55.0%
2007 Actual	77.1%	67.7%	49.5%	42.9%	39.1%	40.4%	20.3%
2008 Target	67.0%	65.0%	62.0%	60.0%	57.0%	54.0%	55.0%
2008 Actual	79.3%	70.6%	51.5%	51.5%	50.6%	46.4%	22.1%
2009 Target	67.0%	65.0%	62.0%	60.0%	57.0%	54.0%	55.0%
2009 Actual	84.9%	80.0%	56.5%	56.2%	54.1%	39.5%	23.6%
2009 Status	Target met	Target met	Target not met	Target not met	Target not met	Target not met	Target not met
2009 Status	Target met at two grade levels for the 2009-2010 School Year						

Source: MDE/OEAA

The targets displayed in Tables 4 and 5 match those articulated in the *Michigan Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook* (Amended June 2010).

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed

Timelines	Activities	Status
PROVIDE TRAINING/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT		
2005-2011	1. Continue dissemination of information on the appropriate use of assessment accommodations, using conference sessions, joint presentations with accommodations/assistive technology groups and newsletter articles.	<p>The OEAA disseminated accommodations information at its fall 2009 conferences held in three locations throughout Michigan, in issues of <i>The OEAA Coordinator Updates</i>, and through listserv messages to district coordinators and assessment administrators. Michigan's Assessment Accommodation Summary Table was updated to reflect changes to Michigan's Educational Assessment System. The State Board of Education approved the revised Assessment Accommodation Summary Table in September 2009. The revised Assessment Accommodation Table has been posted to state assessment Web pages, along with a Frequently Asked Questions document.</p> <p>There were September and February Webcasts for district coordinators and assessment administrators in order to disseminate updates to testing procedures.</p>
2005-2011	2. Determine the level of involvement with Michigan's State Improvement Grant (SIG) building level systems change model.	Michigan's Integrated Improvement Initiatives (MI3) consultants, formerly known as SIG consultants, presented their work on mathematics at all three 2009 OEAA Fall Conferences. In addition, the consultants have been working with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) General Supervision Enhancement Grant (GSEG) for developing Alternate Assessments based on Modified

Timelines	Activities	Status
		Achievement Standards (AA-MAS) with curricular and instructional supports.
2005-2011	3. Collaborate with Michigan's Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative (MiBLSi) to develop support systems and sustained implementation of a data-driven, problem-solving model.	<p>MiBLSi, a Response to Intervention (RtI) initiative, provided training and supports for school wide Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) and literacy achievement. MiBLSi continued to scale up its presence into over 500 school buildings within Michigan. This represents MiBLSi activity in 45 of the 57 intermediate school districts (ISDs) within the state.</p> <p>In MiBLSi elementary schools this year, seven percent more students are meeting or exceeding standards on the Michigan Education Assessment Program reading component (approximately 25 more students per school). At middle school the percent of students scoring at or above grade level in reading measures increased from 69 percent to 75 percent.</p>
2008-2011	4. The OEAA will make all the artwork used on its science and mathematics Alternate Assessments based on Alternate Achievement Standards (AA-AAS) available for teachers to incorporate into instruction.	Michigan posted updated mathematics and ELA artwork used in MI-Access assessments to the web page in October 2009.
2009-2011	5. Develop and disseminate guidelines on selecting the appropriate assessment for students with disabilities.	Michigan is completing its work on the selection guidelines online learning program and will continue in its efforts to provide professional development on selecting appropriate state assessments.
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2005-2011	6. Implement required elements of the <i>No Child Left Behind</i>	There was ongoing collaboration between the Office of Special

Timelines	Activities	Status
	accountability systems as outlined in the Michigan Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Membership in MDE workgroups • Continued support for improvements to the Michigan DRAFT Guidelines for Determining Participation in State Assessment for Students with Disabilities. 	Education and Early Intervention Services (OSE-EIS) and OEAA to recruit stakeholders for review committees and development teams. The OSE-EIS, OEAA, and the Office of Education Improvement and Innovation (OEII) collaborated in the implementation of an OSEP GSEG to develop a comprehensive model using existing general assessments to develop AA-MAS and curricular and instructional supports.
2009-2011	7. Systemically monitor students with disabilities' participation in state assessment, verify the student's IEP designates the state assessment, confirm the appropriate state assessment was given, verify the provision of accommodations, if specified in IEP and verify the assessment selected for English language learners with disabilities.	The OSE-EIS conducted a monitoring pilot in the fall of 2009. Ten students with disabilities were selected from a local district within each of ten ISDs. Current IEPs were examined to confirm the appropriate state assessment was given and the student was provided with the appropriate accommodations. The monitoring project will be expanded to include all ISDs in fall 2010.
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT		
2007-2011	8. As part of its efforts to ensure the appropriate participation of all students with disabilities in statewide assessment, Michigan has chosen to develop an AA-MAS. The MDE has received a GSEG from the USED to develop and implement the assessment, as well as a comprehensive online learning program designed to ensure appropriate student participation and support instruction.	Michigan administered its AA-MAS known as MEAP-Access operationally in fall 2009. Based on the results, Michigan modified the item development process using research from other states. Michigan's cognitive laboratories used think-aloud methods with students and interviews with teachers in order to validate the modifications to test items and passages needed for the eventual re-operational use of MEAP-Access. These activities were conducted to ensure the

Timelines	Activities	Status
		new items were appropriately accessible by the targeted population.
2008-2011	9. Michigan will enhance its AA-AAS item writing procedures.	<p>Michigan is using a new four-phase item writing module that incorporates online item writer training from content specialists, sample item submission and feedback, and culminates in an item writing session on-site. Extended Depth of Knowledge levels are assigned to all new items. All items are written by Michigan educators.</p> <p>The feedback from item writers on the new process is positive. As a result of improved item writer training, few items require revisions before placement on a test.</p>
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2005-2011	10. Participate with the OSI, Field Services Unit teams to provide targeted technical assistance to high priority schools. ¹⁵	The OSE-EIS collaborated with the OSI (currently known as the Office of Educational Improvement and Innovation) by participating in the Michigan Continuous School Improvement team meetings and training sessions offered to Title I schools, including the high priority schools.
2009-2011	11. Develop and disseminate tools to assist districts in using standards-based IEPs.	In spring 2010, the standards-based IEP policies and procedures were incorporated into Michigan's model IEP form and process to link explicitly to the general curriculum. Training and dissemination of supporting materials has begun and will continue into the 2010-2011 school year.

¹⁵ Schools in School Improvement Phase 1 or higher.

Timelines	Activities	Status
EVALUATION		
2007-2011	12. The MDE, as part of a state consortium, has been awarded a three-year GSEG from the U.S. Department of Education to study the consequential validity of AA-AAS. Michigan, along with Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, and the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC) will conduct a nine-year longitudinal study to gather consequential evidence.	Michigan is participating in this study in order to ensure that its AA-AAS are having their intended consequences, in addition to providing valuable curricular and instructional information for Michigan educators, parents and other stakeholders related to students with disabilities who participate in Michigan's AA-AAS. Michigan participated in the development of a comprehensive survey designed to assess unintended consequences of administering AA-AAS. The first annual survey was administered in fall 2009.
2008–2011	13. The National Alternate Assessment Center (NAAC) has recently completed a comprehensive alignment study of all three of Michigan's AA-AAS. As a result, Michigan now has a significant amount of data indicating the alignment between these AA-AAS and state content standards. Michigan will review this data and make needed revisions to the assessment design or items necessary to ensure that state content standards are being appropriately measured for each student population assessed by Michigan's three AA-AAS in the content areas of English language arts, mathematics and science.	Michigan conducted an inventory of the AA-AAS item bank to determine if all state assessable content standards have high quality items written to assess the state content standards. Michigan used the results of the item bank inventory to develop new items in the summers of 2009 and 2010. Content Advisory Committees reviewed all new items to ensure alignment between state content standards and new items.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2009:

Michigan met its FFY 2009 target for percentage of districts meeting AYP objectives for the disability subgroup. Michigan met its FFY 2009 participation targets in ELA and mathematics for students with IEPs in all grades except grade 11. Proficiency targets were met for grades 3 and 4 mathematics. Proficiency targets were not met in reading in any grades.

Michigan improved the participation rate on statewide assessment for students with IEPs in grade 11 in reading but showed a slight decline in mathematics participation. The data submitted for FFY 2008 indicate that the grade 11 participation rate for reading was 92.7 percent, which improved to 93 percent for FFY 2009. Michigan demonstrated a slight decline in grade 11 mathematics participation in FFY 2009 (92 percent down from 92.5 percent in FFY 2008).

Michigan's targets for proficiency are the same for all student subgroups including students with IEPs. Table 5 lists the grade level targets separately for reading and mathematics by year.

Michigan demonstrated improvement in all grades in reading proficiency, with notable gains observed across all grades. Michigan demonstrated improvement in all grades in mathematics proficiency with the exception of grade 8. Grades 3 and 4 showed significant gains in mathematics proficiency. Table 5 reveals that Michigan's students with IEPs did not meet the proficiency targets in any grades in reading or grades 5-8 and 11 for mathematics.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2009

Michigan made the decision to separate ELA into two distinct components: reading and writing, effective FFY 2009-2010. Reading is still assessed statewide in grades 3-8 and 11, while writing is only assessed statewide in grades 4, 7 and 11. Since the prior AYP proficiency targets were based on total ELA scores and not just reading, Michigan decided to increase the proficiency targets for reading. This resulted in the reading targets not being met in any grade.

Michigan Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP

Indicator Status							OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 99.4%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 98.5%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 94.0%.							OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.	None required per FFY 2008 Response Table
The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are:							OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.	None required per FFY 2008 Response Table
Grade	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target		
	Reading			Math				
3	99.1%	98.5%	95.0%	99.4%	99.0%	95.0%		
4	98.8%	98.5%	95.0%	99.1%	98.9%	95.0%		
5	99.2%	98.9%	95.0%	99.8%	99.4%	95.0%		
6	99.7%	98.5%	95.0%	98.7%	99.1%	95.0%		
7	98.3%	98.3%	95.0%	98.7%	99.0%	95.0%		
8	98.3%	97.6%	95.0%	98.8%	98.4%	95.0%		
HS	90.5%	92.7%	95.0%	91.8%	92.5%	95.0%		
The data source for this indicator has changed. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine progress or slippage from FFY 2007 data. The State met part of its FFY 2008 targets. The State provided a web link to 2008 publicly-reported assessment results. http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-22709_25058--,00.html								

Indicator Status							OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.							OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.	None required per FFY 2008 Response Table
The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are:								
Grade	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target		
	Reading			Math				
3	57.9%	60.0%	60.0%	77.1%	79.3%	67.0%		
4	50.5%	50.6%	59.0%	67.7%	70.6%	65.0%		
5	48.9%	48.8%	57.0%	49.5%	51.5%	62.0%		
6	49.0%	49.0%	56.0%	42.9%	51.5%	60.0%		
7	42.1%	48.8%	54.0%	39.1%	50.6%	57.0%		
8	43.6%	43.6%	53.0%	40.4%	46.6%	54.0%		
HS	24.5%	28.0%	61.0%	20.3%	22.1%	55.0%		
The data source for this indicator has changed. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine progress or slippage from FFY 2007 data. The State met part of its FFY 2008 targets.								
The State provided a web link to 2008 publicly-reported assessment results.								
http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-22709_25058-__,00.html								

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**Overview of Indicator 4A (Suspension/Expulsion) Report Development:**

1. See General Overview pages 3-7.
2. In March 2009, the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) instituted a one-year data lag for this indicator so that the required monitoring elements could be completed prior to report submission. Therefore, 2008-2009 data are reported in this FFY 2009 APR.
3. During 2008-2009 Michigan required all districts to report suspension and expulsion data for students with disabilities in the state's Single Record Student Database (SRSD). The Center for Educational Performance and Information maintains this data system. Significant discrepancy was calculated using only data regarding students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) since comparable information is not available for students without disabilities.
4. Beginning with the 2008-2009 discipline data, a district was identified as having a significant discrepancy in rates of suspensions/expulsions if more than five percent of its students with IEPs ages 3-21 were suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days cumulatively during the school year. Since this is a new definition of significant discrepancy, comparisons with previous years' data are not possible.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE¹⁶/Suspension/Expulsion

(Results Indicator)

Indicator 4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Definition of Significant Discrepancy:

A district was identified as having a significant discrepancy in rates of suspensions and expulsions if more than five percent of its students with IEPs received out-of-school suspensions/expulsions for greater than 10 days cumulatively during the school year. Districts with fewer than five students with IEPs suspended/expelled for more than ten days were exempt from significant discrepancy calculations. This new protocol was reported in Michigan's FFY 2008 State Performance Plan (SPP).

¹⁶ Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment.

Statewide, 3.1 percent of students with IEPs were suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
Calculations Using Previous Definition of Significant Discrepancy			
2005	1.2%		
2006		< 10.0%	1.5%
2007		< 9.0%	1.4%
OSEP Prescribed a One Year Data Lag for This Indicator			
2008 (2007-2008 data)		< 9.0%	1.4%
Calculations Using Current Definition of Significant Discrepancy			
2009 (2008-2009 data)	5.1%*	< 5.5%	5.1%*
Percent = [(# of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100. *[42 ÷ 821] X 100			

Source: SRSD, verification review

Review of Policies, Procedures and Practices

Thirty-nine (39) of the 42 districts were newly identified for focused monitoring activities. For the remaining three districts that had been previously focused monitored, one had no findings of noncompliance. Of the two districts with findings, noncompliance was corrected. Through on-site visits, changes to the policies, procedures and practices were verified, and the districts were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s). During February and March 2010, the OSE-EIS conducted thirty-four focused monitoring on-site reviews and five self reviews of these districts' policies, procedures and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA). Thirty-five (35) of the 39 districts were found to have inappropriate policies, procedures and/or practices and were issued findings of noncompliance. Upon notification, these 35 districts were required to develop and implement a corrective action plan to come into compliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year including verification.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed

Timelines	Activities	Status
IMPROVE DATA COLLECTION		
2006-2011	1. Continue the review of suspension/expulsion data and report progress toward meeting targets in the APR.	The OSE-EIS continued to collect and analyze suspension/expulsion data. The data reported here are a summary of Wayne State University's analysis of the data after verification.
IMPROVE COLLABORATION/COORDINATION		
2008-2011	2. Collaborate with Michigan's Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative (MiBLSi) personnel to continue to reduce the rate of suspensions/expulsions in the state.	<p>The OSE-EIS provided MiBLSi with a list of districts with high suspension/expulsion rates. These districts were then given priority for participation if they chose to apply.</p> <p>MiBLSi is pulling data for us about reduction in suspension/expulsion particularly those >10 days.</p>

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2009:

Michigan met its FFY 2009 target for this indicator. During the 2008-2009 school year, 5.1 percent of the districts in the state had more than 5 percent of their students with IEPs suspended/expelled for more than 10 days. This new baseline is not comparable to the previous rates, because the state changed its definition of significant discrepancy. Twenty-two districts were excluded from the significant discrepancy calculation because they had fewer than five students suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days.

The state has increased efforts to obtain accurate and complete data as well as assure identified districts' compliance with the IDEA through monitoring and technical assistance.

The OSE-EIS communication efforts described in the APR Overview, along with the intermediate school districts' (ISDs) efforts to assist their local districts with timely data submission, resulted in a more accurate picture of the rates of suspensions/expulsions.

Efforts targeting improved data collection, including work with ISD directors, as well as targeted technical assistance activities have been effective in addressing data submission issues. Michigan's inclusion of the timeliness of districts' data submissions as a factor in district Determinations and focused monitoring activities have enhanced districts' attention to both their data collection and discipline procedures.

At the time of the 2008-2009 data submission to EDFacts on November 1, 2009, final district data was being verified as the first step in focused monitoring.

Therefore the EDFacts data do not match exactly the data used as the basis for Indicator 4A.

Timely Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the state made during FFY 2008 (the period from July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009)	31
2. Number of FFY 2008 findings the state verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	26
3. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2) above]	5

FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance and/or Not Corrected):

4. Number of FFY 2008 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	5
5. Number of FFY 2008 findings the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	3
6. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5) above]	2

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance (See Indicator 15)

Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
1	4A	6	The district's practices related to the suspension and expulsion of students with IEPs were not compliant with the IDEA regulations.	<p>Finding Issued: August 7, 2008 as a result of a focused monitoring activity.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: The OSE-EIS required a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) based on a root cause analysis. Increased state supervision and technical assistance were provided.</p> <p>Status: Corrected Date: November 4, 2010 Verified by: OSE-EIS technical assistance provider.</p>
2	4A	8	The district's practices related to the suspension and expulsion of students with IEPs were not compliant with the IDEA regulations.	<p>Finding Issued: April 15, 2009 as a result of a focused monitoring activity.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and provided technical assistance. As a result, the district revised its policies and procedures for suspension/expulsion, provided evidence of ensuring provision of procedural safeguards to parents, and provided professional development on these activities within a year of issuing the findings of noncompliance. However, student record reviews did not indicate full compliance.</p> <p>The OSE-EIS increased state supervision including subsequent student record reviews and site visits conducted in collaboration with the ISD on June 7, October 20 and December 6 of 2010 and January 5 of 2011. The OSE-EIS found continued noncompliance. The district superintendent is directed to provide compensatory education services to students not</p>

Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
				provided with a FAPE. Additional student record reviews and professional development are scheduled to ensure full compliance. Status: Uncorrected
3	4A	29	The district's practices related to the suspension and expulsion of students with IEPs were not compliant with the IDEA regulations.	<p>Finding Issued: April 15, 2009 as a result of a focused monitoring activity.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and provided technical assistance. As a result, the district developed a process to conduct Manifestation Determination Reviews (MDR) if a pattern of removals exists or students are suspended for more than ten consecutive days, ensuring the provision of procedural safeguards to parents, and provided professional development on these activities within a year of issuing the findings of noncompliance. Student record reviews did not indicate 100% compliance.</p> <p>The OSE-EIS increased state supervision including subsequent student record reviews and site visits conducted in collaboration with the ISD on September 21, 27, October 6, 14, and December 13 of 2010 and January 6 of 2011 found continued noncompliance. The district has recently employed a full-time special education director. The district superintendent is directed to provide additional professional development and ensure adherence to MDR timelines and full compliance with all requirements. Additional student record reviews are scheduled to</p>

Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
				ensure full compliance. Status: Uncorrected
4	4A	44	The district's practices related to the suspension and expulsion of students with IEPs were not compliant with the IDEA regulations.	Finding Issued: April 15, 2009 as a result of a focused monitoring activity. Summary of Activities: The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis. Increased state supervision and technical assistance were provided. Status: Corrected Verified by: OSE-EIS technical assistance provider on November 24, 2010.
5	4A	52	The district's practices related to the suspension and expulsion of students with IEPs were not compliant with the IDEA regulations.	Finding Issued: December 17, 2008 as a result of a focused monitoring activity. Summary of Activities: The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis. Increased state supervision and technical assistance were provided. Status: Corrected Verified by: OSE-EIS technical assistance provider on October 15, 2010.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2009

Timelines	New and Revised Activities	Justification
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2010-2011	<i>New Activity:</i> Provide Technical Assistance in response to major patterns of focused monitoring findings for example; create a webinar <i>based on the OSE-EIS Discipline Guidance</i> document.	Provide technical assistance providers with clear and consistent guidance for answering the field's questions to bring districts into compliance.

Timelines	New and Revised Activities	Justification
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
	Resources OSE-EIS, Continuous Improvement and Compliance Unit, CIMS	

Michigan Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 1.4 percent. Because the State's actual target data for this indicator are from the same year as the data reported for this indicator in the State's FFY 2007 APR, OSEP cannot comment on whether there is progress or slippage. The State met its FFY 2007 target of <9 percent.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of "significant discrepancy."</p> <p>The State reported that it reviewed the LEA's policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2007.</p> <p>The State reported that it revised (or required the affected LEAs to revise), the LEA's policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 and FFY 2007 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) was partially corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 and FFY 2007 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s).</p>	<p>Michigan has verified that 15 of the 20 districts with noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 and FFY 2007 are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) within one year of notification. Three additional districts were verified as corrected beyond one year. The two remaining districts with uncorrected noncompliance are receiving increased state supervision and technical assistance.</p>

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>ensure compliance with the IDEA, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2007.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 through the review of policies, procedures and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) of LEAs identified as having a significant discrepancy based on FFY 2005 data was corrected.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 and FFY 2008 through the review of policies, procedures and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), of LEAs identified as having a significant discrepancy based on FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 data was partially corrected.</p> <p>The State reported that it identified four findings of noncompliance in FFY 2008 through the review of policies, procedures and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), of LEAs identified as having a significant discrepancy based on FFY 2007 data. The State reported that the one-year timeline for correction has not ended.</p>		

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

1. See SPP General Overview pages 1-8.
2. Indicator 4B is a compliance indicator with a target of zero percent.
3. In March 2009, the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) designated Indicator 4B as a new indicator, revising the indicator language and measurement. This required states to establish a new baseline in the FFY 2009 SPP and Annual Performance Report (APR).
4. In March 2009, the OSEP instituted a one-year data lag for this indicator so that the required monitoring elements could be completed prior to report submission. Therefore, FFY 2008 (2008-2009) data are reported in this FFY 2009 SPP.
5. Methodology used to calculate significant discrepancy is described later in this document.
6. The previous SPP section for this indicator is included as Appendix G of the SPP as a historical reference.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE¹⁷ / Suspension/Expulsion

(Compliance Indicator)

Indicator 4B:

Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs); and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and support, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Measurement:

Percent = [(of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and support, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (#of districts in the state times 100)].

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

¹⁷ Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment.

Definition of Significant Discrepancy:

A ratio¹⁸ is calculated for each racial/ethnic group within a district based on the number of students suspended/expelled greater than 10 days. The ratio used depends upon the district's demographic characteristics.

The Weighted Risk Ratio is used when the district's racial/ethnic distribution does not vary significantly from the state's distribution. The Risk Ratio is used when the district's racial/ethnic distribution varies significantly from the state's distribution. The Alternative Risk Ratio is used when the comparison group contains less than 10 students with IEPs.

For this indicator Michigan defines "significant discrepancy" as a ratio greater than 2.0 indicating that students in the racial/ethnic group have a significantly greater risk of being suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days.

Districts with fewer than five students with IEPs suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days are excluded from the significant discrepancy calculation, as are racial/ethnic groups with fewer than three students with IEPs suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days.

Michigan does not collect universal suspension/expulsion data on general education students, therefore a comparison with that population is not possible.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

School districts report disciplinary actions for students with IEPs through the Michigan Student Data System operated by the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI). School districts are expected to report, for every student with an IEP, the number and total length of each type of disciplinary action across the school year. For this indicator, the calculation is based on out-of-school suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days, either in one incident or an accumulation, by race/ethnicity.

The Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services (OSE-EIS) verified FFY 2008 data for all districts that reported zero disciplinary actions or that suspended/expelled less than 1 percent of the districts' students with IEPs. Some school information systems default to zero when fields are left blank, so verification is necessary to determine the accuracy of the zeros. As a result of this verification process, 343 additional students with IEPs were reported as receiving out-of-school suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days.

The monitoring of districts identified as having a significant discrepancy in their rate of suspension/expulsions is an integral part of this indicator's measurement. Districts with a ratio greater than 2.0 for any racial/ethnic group are identified for focused monitoring. The OSE-EIS reviews districts' policies, procedures and

¹⁸ See *Procedures for Data Analysis Regarding Discipline Indicator 4B* in Appendix H.

practices to determine whether they contributed to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Baseline Data for FFY 2008 (2008-2009):

Sixty-seven districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspension/expulsion of greater than 10 days for at least one racial/ethnic group. Twenty-two districts were excluded from the significant discrepancy calculation because they had fewer than five students suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days. During February and March 2010, the OSE-EIS conducted forty-seven focused monitoring on-site reviews and twenty desk audits of these districts' policies, procedures and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act*.

After monitoring, 53 of the 67 districts were found to have inappropriate policies, procedures and/or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy. Two of these districts had a significant discrepancy in two racial/ethnic groups. Each of the 53 districts was issued findings of noncompliance in the spring of 2010. The FFY 2008 baseline of 53 districts equals 6.5 percent of the 821 districts that submitted discipline data for students with IEPs. The table below displays these 53 districts by the racial/ethnic group(s) which had a significant discrepancy. Upon notification of findings of noncompliance, these 53 districts were required to develop and implement a corrective action plan to come into compliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year including verification.

Statewide, 3.1 percent of students with IEPs were suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days.

Racial/Ethnic Group with Significant Discrepancy	Number of Districts with Findings of Noncompliance	Percentage of Districts with Findings of Noncompliance
American Indian	3	0.4%
Asian	0	0.0%
Black	48	5.8%
Hispanic	3	0.4%
White	1	0.1%

Source: Single Record Student Database (SRSD), verification review, monitoring data from the Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System (CIMS)

Measurable and Rigorous Targets:

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008 (2008-2009)	0% of districts will have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year of the children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirement related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and support, and procedural safeguards.
2009 (2009-2010)	0% of districts will have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year of the children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirement related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and support, and procedural safeguards.
2010 (2010-2011)	0% of districts will have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year of the children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirement related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and support, and procedural safeguards.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The FFY 2008 baseline of 6.5 percent is the percent of districts identified as having 1) significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities by race/ethnicity, and 2) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports and procedural safeguards.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Timelines	Activities	Resources
2010-2011	Provide technical assistance providers with consistent guidance in response to patterns of focused monitoring findings.	OSE-EIS Continuous Improvement and Compliance Unit
2010-2011	Provide tools for districts to access and review their racial/ethnic patterns of discipline data.	OSE-EIS Performance Reporting Unit, Wayne State University, CEPI Michigan Student Data System Team (Discipline Report)
2010-2011	Collaborate with Michigan's Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative (MiBLSi) personnel to reduce the rate of disproportionate suspensions/expulsions in the state.	OSE-EIS, MiBLSi

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**Overview of Indicator 5 (Educational Environments) Report Development:**

1. See General Overview pages 3-7.
2. The Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services (OSE-EIS) no longer includes educational environments as an element in district Determinations. Instead, the OSE-EIS has significantly increased the number of districts that participated in focused monitoring activities due to low percentages of students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) inside the regular class 80 percent or more of the day. The OSE-EIS has determined that this is a more effective method for producing measurable improvement in low performing districts.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE¹⁹ / Educational Environments

(Results Indicator)

Indicator 5: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80 percent or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40 percent of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served inside the regular class 80 percent or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served inside the regular class less than 40 percent of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

¹⁹ Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
A. Increase the percentage of students served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2005	54.0%		
2006		≥ 55.0%	50.3%
2007		≥ 57.0%	53.5%
2008		≥ 59.0%	57.6%
2009		≥ 61.0%	61.1%*
Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served in the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100. *[122,145 ÷ 200,057] X 100			

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
B. Decrease the percentage of students served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2005	17.9%		
2006		≤ 16.9%	18.5%
2007		≤ 15.4%	16.8%
2008		≤ 13.9%	15.0%
2009		≤ 12.4%	14.0%*
Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served in the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100. *[28,056 ÷ 200,057] X 100			

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
C. Decrease the percentage of students served in separate facilities			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2005	5.2%		
2006		≤ 5.1%	5.0%
2007		≤ 5.1%	4.8%
2008		≤ 5.0%	4.9%
2009		≤ 4.9%	4.9%*
Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100. *[9,884 ÷ 200,057] X 100			

Source: Michigan Compliance Information System (MI-CIS)

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed

Timelines	Activities	Status
PROVIDE TRAINING/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT		
2006-2011	1. Prioritize targeted districts to receive technical assistance from Michigan's Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative (MiBLSi), a Response to Intervention (RtI) initiative which provides training and supports for school wide Positive Behavior Support (PBS) and literacy achievement.	During FFY 2009 MiBLSi continued to scale up its presence into over 500 school buildings within Michigan. This represents MiBLSi activity in 45 of the 57 intermediate school districts (ISDs) within the state. The OSE-EIS provided MiBLSi with a list of districts with low rates of students with disabilities in general education 80 percent or more of the day. These districts were given priority for participation if they chose to apply.
2008-2011	2. Implement standards-based IEP policies and procedures to increase the ties between IEP development and the general education curriculum.	In spring 2010, the standards-based IEP policies and procedures were incorporated into Michigan's model IEP form and process to link explicitly to the general curriculum. Training and dissemination of supporting materials has begun and will continue into the 2010-2011 school year.
IMPROVE DATA COLLECTION		
2007-2010	3. The OSE-EIS will work with the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI), the Office of Educational Assessment and Accountability (OEAA) and the Office of Education Improvement and Innovation (OEII) in order to develop processes to streamline access to state performance data.	The OSE-EIS continued to work with the CEPI, the OEAA and the OEII on streamlining access to state performance data.
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2007-2011	4. Verify and analyze educational environment data for the set of districts whose percentage of students with disabilities in general education 80 percent or	The OSE-EIS used site visits or desk audits to monitor 40 districts' policies, procedures and practices related to educational environment data. Noncompliance was found in

Timelines	Activities	Status
	more of the day are furthest below the state target. Assist districts in reviewing policies and procedures related to environments data and require them, as needed, to develop and implement improvement plans.	28 of these districts. Upon notification of findings these districts were required to develop and implement corrective action plans to come into compliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year including verification.
2008-2011	5. Districts which fail to correct instances of noncompliance within one year will be required to revise their corrective action plans to achieve compliance. The districts will receive increased OSE-EIS on-site technical assistance including close supervision of the implementation of the revised corrective action plan.	During the FFY 2009, one district failed to correct noncompliance within one year of notification. This district revised its corrective action plan and is receiving increased state supervision to come into compliance. Beginning with the 2010-2011 school year, 20 percent of all <i>Individuals with Disabilities Education Act</i> (IDEA) funds that are requested will be held until the activities outlined in the corrective action plan are completed and proof of compliance is provided.
IMPROVE COLLABORATION/COORDINATION		
2007-2011	6. The OSE-EIS State Performance Plan (SPP) indicator leads analyze how educational environments impact other indicators, particularly disproportionate representation and postsecondary outcomes. Indicator leads will do cross-cutting work among educational environments, disproportionate representation and postsecondary outcomes.	Cross-cutting work continued to examine how educational environments impact disproportionate representation and postsecondary outcomes.
2008-2011	7. Develop and implement a more integrated set of activities across: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The FAPE in the LRE SPP indicators • The Michigan's State Personnel Development Grant, Michigan's Integrated Improvement Initiative (MI3) • Michigan's emerging work with 	Through involvement with the CIMS, the OSE-EIS has been implementing an integrated set of activities by aligning data collection, analysis, focused monitoring, reporting and corrective action activities across indicators. Findings of noncompliance specific to Indicator 5 were issued through the CIMS electronic workbook. For

Timelines	Activities	Status
	the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) General Supervision Framework	additional information, see Explanation of Progress or Slippage section.
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2006-2011	<p>8. Provide technical assistance to districts to assist them with issues such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding how to report educational environment data accurately. This activity will concentrate on defining what constitutes time in special education environment and time in regular education. • Helping data entry staff in LEAs and ISDs to improve the accuracy and consistency of student data reporting. • Emphasize accuracy of data reported for separate facilities. 	<p>During FFY 2009 there was intensive attention to educational environment data collection, in preparation for the FFY 2010 state transition from a separate special education data system into the Michigan Student Data System which is the unified data collection system for all students.</p> <p>The CEPI, the MI-CIS and the OSE-EIS provided technical assistance to districts through conference calls, the CEPI Help Desk, workshops, ISD Director meetings, individualized assistance by phone or email and memoranda highlighting correct procedures for common data reporting errors and the differences in the upcoming data reporting protocol. General education pupil accounting personnel became involved during FFY 2009 in preparation for the system transition.</p>

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2009:

Michigan met two of its three targets. Analysis of the data indicated that progress was made on two of the three targets, while the third target remained steady. There was a 3.5 percent increase in the percentage of students with disabilities served in the regular class 80 percent or more of the day, and this target was met for the first time. There was a one percent decrease in the percentage of students served in the regular class less than 40 percent of the day, but the target was not met. The percentage of students served in separate facilities remained steady, and this target was met again.

Increased Focused Monitoring Activities

Michigan increased the number of districts participating in focused monitoring activities for educational environments in FFY 2009 based on low performance on

target A, the percentage of students with disabilities served in the regular class 80 percent or more of the day. Upon notification, districts with findings of noncompliance developed corrective action plans to correct the noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year including verification. ISD Monitors reported that when a district participated in focused monitoring activities, neighboring districts often began to examine their policies, procedures and practices regarding educational environments as well.

Districts that did not meet all three targets for FFY 2008 were required through the April 2010 CIMS electronic workbook to convene a team to review and analyze their data as well as the underlying issues, strategies for improvement and methods for monitoring progress. The teams were then required to prepare a report of recommendations for their district School Improvement Team. A review of those reports indicates that districts whose data for target A did not meet the state target were examining ways to improve their performance. Many districts noted that they have made progress and have developed strategies for continued improvement. Other districts indicated that they have not made progress and need to take steps to improve. In addition, many districts that met target A were beginning to examine how they can improve their performance in the other two target areas.

Changing Practices

Districts increasingly used team teaching and co-teaching models, as well as differentiated instruction to support students with disabilities and other at-risk students in general education settings. The widespread adoption of Response to Intervention approaches, including MiBLSi, has increased data-based decision-making for instruction. Procedures and practices developed by the STatewide Autism Resources and Training (START) project and implemented by districts have increased instruction of students with autism spectrum disorder in the general education setting. The START procedures and practices are often adapted by districts to improve decision-making and instruction in the general education setting for students with other disabilities as well.

Improved Data

Technical assistance from the OSE-EIS has continued to assist districts in improving accuracy in data reporting for Educational Environments. In addition, the emphasis on using data for decision-making supported through the CIMS process continued to provide impetus for districts to improve their data systems through upgrading software and staff training. Improved data reporting may account for some of the shift in Educational Environments' percentages.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2009

None required at this time.

Michigan Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP

Indicator Status					OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.					OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.	None required per FFY 2008 Response Table.
The State's reported data for this indicator are:						
	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	Progress		
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	53.5	57.6	59	4.10%		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	16.8	15	13.9	1.80%		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	4.8	4.9	5.0	-0.10%		
These data represent progress for 5A and 5B and slippage for 5C from the FFY 2007 data. The State met its FFY 2008 target for 5C, but did not meet its FFY 2008 targets for 5A and 5B.						

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**Overview of Indicator 6 (Preschool Educational Environments) Report Development:**

1. See General Overview pages 3-7.
2. Per The Office of Special Education Program's (OSEP's) Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) and APR Instruction Sheet:

"States are not required to report on Indicator 6 in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011".

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE²⁰ /Preschool Educational Environments

(Results Indicator)

Indicator 6: Percent of preschool children with Individualized Education Program (IEPs) who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings). (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement: Percent = [(# of preschool children with IEPs who received special education services in settings with typically developing peers) divided by the (total # of preschool children with IEPs)] times 100.

Michigan Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR.	The instruction package for the FFY 2009 APR/SPP will provide guidance regarding the information that States must report for this indicator in their FFY 2009 APRs.	None required.

²⁰ Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**Overview of Indicator 7 (Preschool Outcomes) Report Development:**

1. See General Overview pages 3-7.
2. Targets for this Indicator were established for this year. Targets were established by an examination of trend data and through advisory committee input.
3. Summary statements are included in this report and in local level reports. Summary statements were devised by the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Center in order to reduce reported numbers for early childhood outcomes.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE²¹ / Preschool Outcomes

(Results Indicator)

Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with Individualized Education Program (IEPs) who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \text{ times } 100.$
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \text{ times } 100.$
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \text{ times } 100.$

²¹ Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment.

reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = [# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)] divided by [# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d)] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = [# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)] divided by [the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)] times 100.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets for Outcome A: Positive Social-Emotional Skills (including social relationships)			
Summary Statement 1: Of those children who entered the program below expectation in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2008	86.8%		
2009		86.0%	85.5%*
Percent = [# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)] divided by [# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d)] times 100. *[1,271 + 1,611] ÷ [121 + 366 + 1,271 + 1,611] X 100			
Summary Statement 2: The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2008	60.7%		
2009		60.0%	59.8%*
Percent = [# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)] divided by [the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)] times 100. *[1,611 + 1,002] ÷ [121 + 366 + 1,271 + 1,611 + 1,002] X 100			

Source: HighScope Educational Research Foundation

Measurable and Rigorous Targets for Outcome B: Acquiring and Using Knowledge and Skills			
Summary Statement 1: Of those children who entered the program below expectation in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2008	86.5%		
2009		86.0%	86.8%*
Percent = [# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)] divided by [# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d)] times 100. $*[1,362 + 1,720] \div [92 + 376 + 1,362 + 1,720] \times 100$			
Summary Statement 2: The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2008	58.0%		
2009		58.0%	58.2%*
Percent = [# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)] divided by [the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)] times 100. $*[1,720 + 823] \div [92 + 376 + 1,362 + 1,720 + 823] \times 100$			

Source: HighScope Educational Research Foundation

Measurable and Rigorous Targets for Outcome C: Use of Appropriate Behaviors to Meet their Needs			
Summary Statement 1: Of those children who entered the program below expectation in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2008	88.2%		
2009		88.0%	87.7%*
Percent = [# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)] divided by [# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d)] times 100. $*[854 + 1,910] \div [86 + 303 + 854 + 1,910] \times 100$			
Summary Statement 2: The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2008	72.3%		
2009		72.0%	71.6%*
Percent = [# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)] divided by [the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)] times 100. $*[1,910 + 1,219] \div [86 + 303 + 854 + 1,910 + 1,219] \times 100$			

Source: HighScope Educational Research Foundation

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed

Timelines	Activities	Status
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2007-2010	<p>1. Monitor data measuring this indicator and develop additional improvement activities to improve the system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individually, to improve children's IEPs based on results • Locally, to improve service area policy and procedures • Statewide, to improve policy and program decision making, including personnel development. 	<p>Detailed data reports were provided by the Office of Early Childhood Education and Family Services (ECE&FS) to all local districts. Reports included demographics, eligibility data and outcome data relative to state targets and state averages.</p> <p>Regional conferences were offered to districts on using data to improve child outcomes.</p> <p>Professional development materials were made available on the Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Web site (www.michigan.gov/ecse) as resources to improve outcomes for preschool children with special needs.</p>
2009-2011	<p>2. Re-assess progress, activities and resources needed.</p>	<p>A needs assessment to determine professional development and resource needs to increase child outcomes was developed by the Office of ECE&FS and HighScope and disseminated to ECSE administrative staff and teachers.</p> <p>The Office of ECE&FS developed two subgrants to address technical assistance, professional development, and data analysis and reporting. When assessing progress, activities and resources, it was determined that multiple resources such as multi-media presentations and easy reference guides were needed to meet the increasing demands of the ECSE programs.</p>
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2009-2011	<p>3. Develop and implement training and targeted technical assistance for service areas not meeting proposed targets.</p>	<p>Data reports for preschool outcomes were developed for districts with the lowest 25 percent of outcome scores. These districts received detailed reports, including data disaggregated by outcome area, category and scores.</p>

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2009:

Targets were met for two of the six summary statements. For each of the four summary statements where targets were not met, the state performance was a fraction of a percent below the target.

Among the children who entered preschool special education between 2005 and 2010 and exited by June 2010, 4,237 children had exit data reported. Each child was assessed with one of the seven primary assessment tools approved by the Office of ECE&FS as referenced in the SPP.

This was the second year data was collected from all 57 Michigan intermediate school districts (ISDs). The data reported reflect a substantially higher number of children exiting by June 2010 (4,237) than the number of children exiting by June 2009 (2,620). It was anticipated that state performance would decline slightly because this exiting cohort includes a higher proportion of children that have been in ECSE programs for longer periods of time with more intensive needs. For FFY 2008, the span of the average number of months between program entry and exit was 15 months, compared to 17 months for FFY 2009. Targets were set slightly below baseline to reflect that anticipated age shift, reflective of child need.

ISDs had varied resources and levels of support for their districts. The districts had varying data and needs, relative to understanding indicator requirements, collecting child outcome summary data, and using program data to improve child outcomes.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2009

None required at this time.

Michigan Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP

Indicator Status			OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State provided FFY 2008 baseline data, targets, and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator. The State’s FFY 2008 reported baseline data for this indicator are:</p>			<p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2009 with the FFY 2009 APR.</p>	<p>Progress data and actual target data are presented on previous pages.</p>
08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data	<u>Summary Statement 1</u> ²²	<u>Summary Statement 2</u> ²³		
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	86.8	60.7		
Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication) (%)	86.5	58.0		
Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	88.2	72.3		

²² Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.

²³ Summary Statement 2: The percentage of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**Overview of Indicator 8 (Facilitated Parent Involvement) Report Development:**

1. See General Overview pages 3-7.
2. Statewide surveys of parents/families of children and school-age students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) were mailed to all parents of children ages 3 through 5 years who receive special education services and one-third of all parents of school-age children who receive special education services.
3. The preschool parent survey [50 items developed by the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM)] and the school-age parent survey (25 items developed by the NCSEAM) were available in English, Spanish and Arabic. Families also were given the option to complete the survey online or via a telephone interview using Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing technology.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE²⁴ /Facilitated Parent Involvement

(Results Indicator)

Indicator 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement: Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets Preschool (3-5)			
FFY	Baseline²⁵	Target	Actual
2007	34.0%		
2008		34.5%	36.8%
2009		35.0%	47.8%*
Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.			
*[3,314 ÷ 6,938] X 100			

Source: The NCSEAM Parent Survey

²⁴ Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment.

²⁵ New baseline per revised State Performance Plan (SPP).

Measurable and Rigorous Targets School-Age (6-21)			
FFY	Baseline²⁶	Target	Actual
2007	20.5%		
2008		21.0%	25.1%
2009		21.5%	26.2%*
Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.			
*[4,919 ÷ 18,796] X 100			

Source: The NCSEAM Parent Survey

Survey Instrument

There were two versions of the survey for parents of children receiving special education services:

- One for parents of preschool children (ages 3 through 5).
- One for parents of school-age children (ages 6 to 26).²⁷

The preschool parent survey contained 37 NCSEAM items measuring “Efforts to Partner with Parents”, while the school-age parent survey included 25 items measuring this same construct. The preschool survey also contained an additional 13 NCSEAM items measuring “Quality of Services” for a total of 50 items.

Sampling

Surveys were disseminated to all parents of children ages 3 through 5 years who receive special education services (approximately 23,000 families) and one-third of all parents of school-age children who receive special education services (approximately 73,000 families).²⁸

- Parents of school-age children were selected to participate in the survey using an Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) approved cohort sampling plan.
- Approximately one-third of local school districts within every intermediate school district (ISD) were selected to participate in the school-age survey. The exception is the one district with a student population greater than 50,000 that participates on an annual basis.
- Note that although the school-age survey was disseminated to parents of children ages 6 to 26, only the results for children ages 6 through 21 are included in this federal report.

²⁶ New baseline per revised SPP.

²⁷ Michigan provides special education services to children aged birth to 26 years.

²⁸ In households with more than one child receiving special education services, one child was selected at random and parents were asked to respond to the survey based on their experiences with that child.

Response Rates

As of September 1, 2010, 6,938 respondents returned the preschool survey (31.6 percent response rate) and 18,798 returned the school-age (6 through 21) survey (26.3 percent response rate), for a total number of 25,736 responses (27.5 percent total response rate). Two respondents in the school age sample did not complete enough of the survey to receive a valid partnership score. These cases were dropped from the sample resulting in final school age samples of 18,796.

Representativeness of the Sample

Comparisons of child characteristics between the statewide population and respondent sample revealed that the responses are representative of the entire Michigan Part B special education population with two exceptions: the proportion of preschool and school-age children and racial/ethnic composition.

Because of the sampling procedure used, the ratio of survey respondents with preschool age children to respondents with school-age children is greater than the ratio found in the state. However, because results are presented for each sample separately, there is no need to apply weights²⁹ to each sample in order to adjust these proportions.

FFY 2009 Parent Survey Respondents' Child Race/Ethnicity Compared to the State

	Preschool Sample (3-5)	Preschool Statewide Population (3-5)	School-Age Sample (6-21)	School-Age Statewide Population (6-21)
American Indian	0.7% (n=52)*	1.0% (n=231)	1.0% (n=195)	1.1% (n=923)
Asian (includes Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander)	2.8% (n=191)*	2.2% (n=537)	1.5% (n=281)	1.4% (n=1,083)
Black	10.6% (n=734)*	15.5% (n=3,762)	20.7% (n=3,891)*	31.2% (n=25,640)
Hispanic	4.8% (n=333)*	5.8% (n=1,410)	4.4% (n=818)*	5.4% (n=4,452)
White	81.1% (n=5,628)*	75.5% (n=18,304)	72.4% (n=13,611)*	60.9% (n=49,993)

* Difference between sample and statewide is statistically significant.

The table above summarizes respondents' children's race/ethnicity in comparison to statewide demographics. To determine if the difference in racial/ethnic distribution made a significant impact on the findings related to this indicator, weights were applied to adjust the sample sizes for each racial/ethnic group. Weights were calculated by dividing the proportion of each group in the Part B population by the corresponding proportion in the sample.

²⁹ Weights are commonly used to adjust survey results for under- and over-representation of specific subgroups in a sample population. Weighting provides an estimate of the results that would be found if the distribution of a particular characteristic in the sample were identical to the distribution in the overall population.

A comparison of the unweighted results and results after weighting by race/ethnicity showed no significant difference in the scores (see table below). Therefore, even though the sample was not representative in terms of race/ethnicity, the results were not statistically significantly affected.

Indicator 8 Results Before and After Weighting for Race/Ethnicity

	Unweighted		Weighted by Race/Ethnicity	
	n	% at or above standard	n	% at or above standard
Preschool Sample (3-5)	6,938	47.8%	6,942	47.5%
School-Age Sample (6-21)	18,796	26.2%	18,783	25.6%
	mean	standard deviation	mean	standard deviation
Preschool Sample (3-5)	615	140.3%	614	140.1%
School-Age Sample (6-21)	537	127.4%	535	127.7%

Additional details regarding the sampling and weighting procedures are available from the Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services (OSE-EIS).

Results

A final score was derived from responses to all the items in the “Efforts to Partner with Parents” scale.³⁰ Scores ranged from 174 to 907. Michigan’s parents’ surveys yielded an overall average of 615 for ages 3 through 5 and 537 for ages 6 through 21.

Through stakeholder input garnered from focus groups, the NCSEAM set a national standard score of 600. According to the NCSEAM, “The standard is not about agreement with a single item. Given the consistent pattern in families’ responses to the items, a high likelihood of agreement with the threshold item implies the same or greater likelihood of agreement with items located ‘below’ this one on the scale.”³¹ The percentage of parent survey scores of 600 or higher is used to measure this indicator.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed

Timelines	Activities	Status
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2006-2011	1. Wayne State University (WSU) will continue the annual administration of the parent survey data. The results of the parent	The parent survey results continued to be used for the APR and the CIMS. FFY 2008 parent survey results were referenced in the

³⁰ From the Avatar International, Inc. report, “IDEA Part B Special Education Parent Survey Results Pertaining to OSEP SPP/APR Indicator 8”.

³¹ NCSEAM (2006). Use of the NCSEAM Family Survey to Address the SPP/APR Indicator on Family Outcomes available at: <http://www.monitoringcenter.lsuhsd.edu/PDF%20PPT/June%206.pdf>.

Timelines	Activities	Status
	surveys will be used for the APR and the Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System (CIMS) Review and Analysis Process.	CIMS electronic workbook.
IMPROVE COLLABORATION/COORDINATION		
2007-2011	2. Facilitate informal gatherings between representatives from the parent grants, key OSE-EIS personnel, and other Mandated Activities Projects ³² (MAPs).	Initial meetings toward meaningful collaboration between the Michigan Alliance for Families ³³ and other MAPs took place: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Michigan Special Education Mediation Program (MSEMP) • STatewide Autism Resources and Training • Reaching and Teaching Struggling Learners • Michigan Transition Outcomes Project
2007-2011	3. Develop and implement a more integrated set of activities across indicators that will enhance the impact of discrete indicator activities (e.g., work with Michigan's State Personnel Development Grant; analyze across indicator-specific data sets; i.e., child find/identification rates).	Michigan's Integrated Improvement Initiatives (MI3) created opportunities for the integrated activities personnel to come together to expand their knowledge of the impact of parent involvement. <p>Several two-day MI3 Community Learning Forums took place on the topics of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation Science 101 • Professional development • Coaching <p>In each of these learning forums, the Michigan Alliance for Families fully participated and networked, demonstrating the benefit of parent involvement.</p> <p>The Michigan Alliance for Families also fully participated in six MI3 Leadership Team meetings, with representatives from the OSE-EIS and the MAPs.</p>

³² Michigan's state improvement and compliance initiatives, funded with IDEA administrative set-aside funds.

³³ Michigan's Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) beginning 10/1/2009.

Timelines	Activities	Status
EVALUATION		
2008-2011	<p>4. Communicate the instructions for viewing the results of the parent surveys to districts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide WSU and the OSE-EIS support to enable districts to more easily access and interpret the results of the parent surveys. • Update the WSU Web site to be more user-friendly. • Link the information provided on the OSE-EIS public reporting Web site to the WSU parent survey results Web site and update the public reporting text to include an explanation of the survey calibration. 	<p>A new version of the WSU Web site was developed and released in May 2010.</p> <p>http://www.cus.wayne.edu/ecd</p>
2008-2011	<p>5. Assess, monitor and evaluate progress on activities and resources needed to effect systems change on this indicator.</p>	<p>Families and educators indicated through conference evaluations and surveys that activities and resources were appropriate and positively impacted systems change on this indicator.</p>
2008-2011	<p>6. Provide evidence-based resource material to districts regarding strategies to facilitate parent involvement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide links on the WSU Web site, the OSE-EIS Public Reporting Web site and the CIMS-2 Web site to the material that the NCSEAM developed in collaboration with the Future of School Psychology Task Force on Family School Partnerships. • Recruit two MI3 projects whose work involves training and technical assistance to educators and administrators to explore the option of incorporating this resource into their existing technical assistance resources. 	<p>A new version of the WSU Web site was released in May 2010.</p> <p>http://www.cus.wayne.edu/ecd</p> <p>Michigan Alliance for Families and MSEMP have established a strong partnership:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MSEMP is part of the consistent training series the Michigan Alliance for Families provides in each region. • The Michigan Alliance for Families has a representative that is part of the MSEMP Individualized Education Program Leadership Series. <p>These activities were continued.</p> <p>These activities expanded to include other MAPs and the OSE-EIS.</p>

Timelines	Activities	Status
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representatives from the Michigan Behavior and Learning Support Initiative, (MiBLSi), the Michigan Alliance for Families and MI3 developed a work plan to incorporate family involvement in MiBLSi schools. Representatives from the OSE-EIS fully included representatives from the Michigan Alliance for Families in the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> OSE-EIS one pager on Timeline for Initials, development and roll out of accompanying webinar development of the state IEP, beta training feedback loops and roll out of guidance documents Work began with the MI3 initiatives to identify the key evidence-based practices of facilitated parent involvement that connect this indicator with student outcomes.
2007-2011	<p>7. Implement a comprehensive outreach plan to share:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The purpose of the parent surveys. The distribution methodology for the surveys. The findings and meaning of Michigan's baseline and subsequent APR measure scores. Expectations that schools have responsibility for facilitating parent involvement. <p>This will be accomplished through presentations to districts and Parent Advisory Committees regarding survey results both in person and using technology.</p>	<p>Informational materials were developed and are available upon request.</p> <p>An overview of this indicator presented by representatives from MI3, MSEMP, and WSU took place at the following conferences during break out sessions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education³⁴ in August 2009 The Michigan Association of School Social Workers in October 2009 The ISD Planner/Monitors in April 2010

³⁴ Michigan's state affiliate of the National Council for Administrators of Special Education and the Council for Exceptional Children.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2009:

Michigan met both its FFY 2009 preschool target (35.0 percent) and school-age target (21.5 percent).

Compared to the FFY 2008 Part B parent surveys, the percent of parents of preschool students at or above the standard in FFY 2009 was higher (47.8 percent versus 36.8 percent). Similarly, the percent of surveys of parents of school-age students at or above the standard was higher in FFY 2009 than the previous year (26.2 percent versus 25.1 percent).

There is insufficient information to attribute this increase to specific activities at this time.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2009

Timelines	New and Revised Activities	Justification
2007-2011 2007-2010	<i>Change in Timeline of Activity #2:</i> Facilitate informal gatherings between representatives from the parent grants, key OSE-EIS personnel, and other Mandated Activities Projects (MAPs).	The Michigan Alliance for Families has been funded since 2006. There is no longer a need for these informal meetings to introduce the Michigan Alliance for Families to the key OSE-EIS staff and other MAPs.
2008-2011 2008-2010	<i>Change in Timeline of Activity #4:</i> Communicate the instructions for viewing the results of the parent surveys to districts. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide WSU and the OSE-EIS support to enable districts to more easily access and interpret the results of the parent surveys. • Update the WSU Web site to be more user-friendly. • Link the information provided on the OSE-EIS public reporting Web site to the WSU parent survey results Web site and update the public reporting text to include an explanation of the survey calibration. 	This activity was completed in May 2010.

Timelines	New and Revised Activities	Justification
2008-2011	<i>Deletion of Activity #5:</i> Assess, monitor and evaluate progress on activities and resources needed to effect systems change on this indicator.	These activities are no longer necessary as they are included in the work of MI3.

Michigan Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>The State revised the baseline and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported preschool (3-5) data for this indicator are 36.8 percent. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 34 percent. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 34.5 percent.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported school-age (6-21) data for this indicator are 25.1 percent. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 20.5 percent. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 21 percent.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2008 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</p>	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.	None required per FFY 2008 Response Table.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**Overview of Indicator 9 (Disproportionate Representation—Child with a Disability) Report Development:**

1. See General Overview pages 3-7.
2. The Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services (OSE-EIS) used a weighted risk ratio (WRR) to calculate disproportionate representation for a school district when the district's population reflected the same racial/ethnic distribution as that of the state. A risk ratio (RR) was used instead of a WRR to determine disproportionate representation when the racial/ethnic distribution of the district's student population varied significantly from the state racial/ethnic distribution³⁵. This ratio was more appropriate, because it compared identification rates by race/ethnicity with the district's student population. An alternate risk ratio (ARR) was used to determine disproportionate representation for a particular racial/ethnic subgroup when there were fewer than 10 students with disabilities in all other racial/ethnic subgroups (disability comparison subgroup). The OSE-EIS recognized that it was not appropriate to forego use of the ARR in favor of the RR.
3. *Procedures for Calculation of Local Educational Agency (LEA) Disproportionate Representation* was refined to provide greater clarity about the use of the WRR, RR and ARR.
4. Focused monitoring selection criteria were refined to identify districts that were candidates for monitoring activities due to data indicating disproportionate representation.

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation—Child with a Disability

(Compliance Indicator)

Indicator 9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2009, describe how the State made its annual determination that the disproportionate representation it identified (consider both over and underrepresentation) of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a); e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining

³⁵ See Appendix C *Procedures for Calculation of LEA Disproportionate Representation* number 6 for further explanation.

disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum 'n' size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2009 reporting period; i.e., after June 30, 2010. If inappropriate identification is identified, report on corrective actions taken.

Definition of Disproportionate Representation:

Michigan's operational definition of districts with disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification includes:

	Over-Representation	Under-Representation
Step 1: Identify Districts with Disproportionate Representation	For the FFY 2009 APR, the two school years considered were FFY 2008 (2008-2009) and FFY 2009 (2009-2010). A verified ratio ³⁶ >2.5 in two consecutive years for any race/ethnicity subgroup was used to identify districts for focused monitoring activities.	For the FFY 2009 APR, the two school years considered were FFY 2008 (2008-2009) and FFY 2009 (2009-2010). A verified ratio <0.4 in two consecutive years for any race/ethnicity subgroup was used to identify districts for focused monitoring activities.
Step 2: Analysis of Identification Policies, Procedures and Practices	<p>The OSE-EIS completed on-site focused monitoring visits for identified districts that had:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a verified ratio >3.0 for the second year, • a verified ratio between 2.75 and 3.0 for both years, or • a second year verified ratio that was higher than the first year ratio when the ratio for both years exceeded 2.5. <p>The OSE-EIS reviewed district processes and student records, and conducted interviews to determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of the district's identification policies, procedures or practices. This culminated in a focused monitoring report that included any findings of noncompliance.</p>	<p>The OSE-EIS conducted a desk audit that included a review of the Michigan Education Assessment Program (MEAP) student achievement data for districts with a verified ratio of <0.4 for two consecutive years. For those districts where the percentage of students in a given racial/ethnic group at the lowest MEAP proficiency level was higher than the overall district percentage of students in the lowest proficiency level, the OSE-EIS required a self-review of identification policies, procedures and practices. This culminated in a focused monitoring report that included any findings of noncompliance.</p>

³⁶In cases where the sum of all other students with disabilities equals fewer than ten, an ARR was calculated for the race under consideration, per Westat, Inc. recommendation. A RR was calculated when the racial/ethnic distribution of the district's student population varied significantly from the state racial distribution which was used to calculate WRRs/ARRs. The RR compared identification rates by race/ethnicity with the district's student population.

	Over-Representation	Under-Representation
	<p>All other districts above the threshold were required to complete a desk audit. The desk audit consisted of district staff, in collaboration with the intermediate school district (ISD) planner/monitor, completing a series of probe questions and reviewing student records to determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of the district's identification policies, procedures or practices. The OSE-EIS and select ISD monitors then reviewed the submitted desk audits and determined whether findings were to be issued. This culminated in a focused monitoring report that included any findings of noncompliance.</p> <p>Special considerations for the above focused monitoring activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Districts that were monitored in the fall of 2009 that had an active corrective action plan (CAP) were not required to participate in additional focused monitoring activities. The OSE-EIS provided technical assistance and oversight which ensured timely correction of the findings of noncompliance. • Districts that were monitored in the fall of 2009 and did not have findings of noncompliance were not required to participate in additional focused monitoring activities. • Districts that were monitored in the fall of 2008 and completed a CAP, which was verified by the OSE-EIS, participated in a follow-up interview to ensure the district was maintaining compliant identification policies, procedures and practices. 	

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2006	0.3%	0%	
2007		0%	0.3%
2008		0%	0.1%
2009			0.1%*
Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100. $*[1 \div 755] \times 100$			

Sources: Michigan Compliance Information System (MI-CIS), the Single Record Student Database, Michigan Student Data System

During 2009-2010, the OSE-EIS analyzed FFY 2008 and FFY 2009 data for 755 districts regarding disproportionate representation, of those districts 144 districts were excluded from the disproportionate representation calculations because they had fewer than 30 students with disabilities enrolled. Based on the focused monitoring selection criteria, 14 districts were identified for focused monitoring activities (2 for over-representation and 12 for under-representation). One of these districts (with over-representation of White students) was found to have inappropriate identification policies, procedures and/or practices as represented in the table above. There were no districts with under-representation due to inappropriate identification.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed

Timelines	Activities	Status
PROVIDE TRAINING/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT		
2007-2011	1. The OSE-EIS will provide professional development to ISD planner/monitors in order to address issues regarding disproportionate representation.	ISD planner/monitors with districts selected for focused monitoring activities participated in a workshop in September 2010 to develop the skills needed to implement monitoring and technical assistance activities for those districts. Additional support was provided via monthly Community of Practice (COP) webinars for ISD planner monitors, state monitors and technical assistance providers.

Timelines	Activities	Status
IMPROVE DATA COLLECTION		
2007-2011	2. The OSE-EIS will work with the Center for Educational Performance and Information to refine data collection issues and alignment with new Office of Management and Budget (OMB) multiracial/ethnic coding.	Because Michigan annually uses a two-year pattern of data to identify districts with disproportionate representation, a bridging methodology has been prepared for data analysis and reporting for FFY 2009 to ensure that procedures are ready to accommodate the newly required racial/ethnic codes in FFY 2010. MI-CIS, Michigan's special education child count collection source, inserted the necessary new codes for use during FFY 2009 so that Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) completed between December 1, 2009 and June 30, 2010 reflected the racial/ethnic codes required in FFY 2010.
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2006 -2011	3. Conduct ongoing literature reviews to identify the determinants and appropriate interventions for disproportionate representation. Study districts that in fact exhibit the determinants but do not have disproportionate representation issues.	<p>The OSE-EIS continued to update the information available to school districts regarding research-based practices for eliminating disproportionate representation. This information is available on the Web page at: http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_6598_31834---,00.html) Web page information continues to be routinely shared through training offered to technical assistance providers.</p> <p>The OSE-EIS continued to review state assessment data for under-represented populations within identified districts to determine if there was a correlation between race/ethnicity, student achievement and identification for special education services.</p> <p>States shared methodologies and strategies with colleagues through the Education Information Management Advisory Consortium (EIMAC) special education subcommittee and North</p>

Timelines	Activities	Status
		Central Regional Resource Center conference calls.
2006-2011	4. Meet semi-annually to recommend ways to analyze and address disproportionate representation data issues.	<p>The OSE-EIS data advisory committee continued to consider issues of disproportionate representation as one of its tasks.</p> <p>This advisory committee met three times during the FFY 2009, engaged in several conference calls, and provided input on several documents.</p>
2006-2011	5. Notify LEAs of their disproportionate representation status and the appropriate level of intervention to begin and complete the verification process.	<p>In June 2010, the OSE-EIS notified school districts of their disproportionate representation data for FFY 2008 and FFY 2009.</p> <p>The OSE-EIS worked with Wayne State University to develop a Web page for districts to verify and, if needed, recalculate data for FFY 2008 and FFY 2009.</p> <p>In August 2010, districts were notified of required fall 2010 monitoring activities through the CIMS electronic workbook.</p>
2007–2011	6. Redesign the CIMS self review and improvement plan processes to more comprehensively address issues of disproportionate representation.	<p>The CIMS provided districts selected for a self-review with their disproportionate representation data through the August 2010 electronic workbook. Districts were guided to a worksheet with probe questions regarding their identification policies, procedures and practices to be completed as part of the process available for download through the CIMS Web site: www.cims.cenmi.org. This was paired with a required webinar in September 2010. Districts submitted the completed worksheet for review by the OSE-EIS on October 29, 2010. Upon review by the OSE-EIS, a focused monitoring report was issued in the December 2010 CIMS workbook. Districts with findings were assigned a technical assistance provider and directed to submit a CAP by February</p>

Timelines	Activities	Status
		15, 2011, a progress report by June 1, 2011 and request CAP closeout by September 15, 2011.
2007-2011	7. The OSE-EIS will annually review the calculations used to determine disproportionate representation and adjust the business rules based on district patterns analyzed to yield an increasingly accurate approach.	<p>The OSE-EIS reviewed the calculation used to determine disproportionate representation in order to begin the process of adjusting the calculation procedures. Specific areas of focus included the use of the seven racial/ethnic categories and residency issues regarding students participating in shared educational entities.</p> <p>The OSE-EIS continued to seek guidance regarding data issues during FFY 2009 from the national EIMAC special education subcommittee, the OSEP Data Managers group and at the OSEP Leadership Conference.</p>
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT		
2007–2011	8. Design a training of trainers model for LEA and ISD staff on ways to develop culturally responsive and proficient educational systems.	In lieu of designing a training of trainers model for LEA and ISD staff, the Michigan Special Education Mediation Project created two modules to sensitize mediators to cultural differences.
2007-2011	9. Develop and implement a more integrated set of general supervision activities across: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The general supervision SPP indicators • Michigan's Integrated Improvement Initiatives • Michigan's emerging work with the NCSEAM³⁷ General Supervision Framework 	<p>Through involvement with CIMS, the OSE-EIS developed and implemented an integrated set of activities by aligning data collection, analysis, reporting, and corrective action activities across indicators.</p> <p>There was one district with a finding of noncompliance. The finding was issued to the district in the CIMS electronic workbook on December 15, 2010. The district is required to submit a CAP on or before February 15, 2011.</p>

³⁷ National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring.

Timelines	Activities	Status
2007-2011	10. The OSE-EIS will convene a diverse advisory committee composed of general education and special education stakeholders, data experts, institutions of higher education faculty and members of professional organizations to meet semi-annually.	<p>The OSE-EIS data advisory committee continued to consider issues of disproportionate representation as one of its tasks.</p> <p>This advisory committee met three times during FFY 2009, engaged in several conference calls, and provided input on several documents.</p>
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2007-2011	11. Present information and gather input at conferences and key meetings with key stakeholder groups in order to enhance awareness of issues and prevention strategies, as well as necessary corrective actions.	<p>Representatives of the OSE-EIS participated in EIMAC, OSEP meetings and Regional Resource Center technical assistance calls. The OSE-EIS provided updates at special education administrative meetings. Additionally, presentations regarding the CIMS and focused monitoring lessons learned were provided at the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Michigan Council of Exceptional Children State Conference • Upper Peninsula Annual Conference • Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education³⁸ Summer Institute • Michigan Association of Public School Academies • Special Education Advisory Committee³⁹ • ISD planner/monitor meetings <p>ISD planner/monitor and state monitor and technical assistance providers monthly COP webinars.</p>
2007-2011	12. Design and maintain a Web page with resources and links to critical information on disproportionate representation.	<p>The OSE-EIS expanded the Web page found at: http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_6598_31834---,00.html</p> <p>The Web page included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • information about disproportionate representation including the

³⁸ Michigan's state affiliate of the National Council for Administrators of Special Education and the Council for Exceptional Children.

³⁹ Michigan's IDEA mandated special education State Advisory Panel.

Timelines	Activities	Status
		<p><i>Procedures for Calculation of LEA Disproportionate Representation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> links to agencies and organizations that can assist school districts research best practice literature regarding disproportionate representation. <p>Information about the updated Web page was presented to monitoring teams for use during site visits and to technical assistance providers for dissemination to districts. It has been shared with all districts monitored for disproportionate representation.</p>
2007-2011	13. The OSE-EIS will prepare resource materials and develop and disseminate products, tools, and training based on <i>Individuals with Disabilities Education Act</i> requirements for Child Find.	Each district identified with findings was required to improve and correct Child Find strategies and interventions as part of the development of a CAP through the CIMS process.
2007-2011	14. The OSE-EIS will provide technical assistance regarding CAPs related to noncompliance and assist LEAs in revising policies, procedures and/or practices.	As part of the CIMS process, a technical assistance provider was assigned to each district identified with findings of noncompliance to assist with the development and implementation of CAPs to ensure appropriate policies, procedures and practices.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2009:

Michigan did not meet the zero percent target for Indicator 9. In FFY 2009 Michigan's performance was consistent with FFY 2008. For FFY 2009, three districts were identified with disproportionate representation due to over-representation – one because of over-representation of Hispanic students, one because of over-representation of White students, and one because of over-representation of American Indian students. Two of these districts participated in a focused monitoring onsite review of its identification policies, procedures and practices. The third district, which had been monitored during the previous year and was implementing a CAP, received an alert in the Monitoring Activities Report in the CIMS August 15 workbook. The alert will ensure the district awareness of the disproportionate representation data and the need to continue to implement the activities in the CAP. One of the three districts (with over-representation of White

students) was found to have inappropriate identification policies, procedures and/or practices. The two remaining districts did not have findings of noncompliance. For FFY 2009, 12 districts were identified with disproportionate representation due to under-representation – ten because of under-representation of Asian students and two because of under-representation of White students. The OSE-EIS conducted a desk audit for the 12 districts. Results of the desk audit for 11 of the 12 districts indicated that students in the identified racial/ethnic group were performing at or above the district average for Level Four (Not Proficient) on the MEAP. The final district, in which the data indicated that the students in the identified racial/ethnic group were below the district average for Level Four, also participated in a self-review. There were no findings of noncompliance for any of the 12 districts.

Timely Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2008 (the period from July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009)	2
2. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	2
3. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	0

FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance and/or Not Corrected:

4. Number of FFY 2008 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	0
5. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	0
6. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2009

Timelines	New and Revised Activities	Justification
2007-2011	<i>Deletion of Activity #8.</i> Design a training of trainers model for LEA and ISD staff on ways to develop culturally responsive and proficient educational systems.	In lieu of designing a training of trainers model for LEA and ISD staff, the Michigan Special Education Mediation Project created two modules to sensitize mediators to cultural differences.

Michigan Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 0.1 percent. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 0.3 percent. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 0 percent.</p> <p>The State reported that ten districts were newly identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State also reported that one district was identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State reported that</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2009 APR demonstrating compliance. Because the State reported less than 100 percent compliance for FFY 2008 (greater than 0 percent actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the district identified in FFY 2008 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100 percent compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report the total number of districts identified in FFY 2009 with</p>	<p>The district identified in FFY 2008 as having disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic subgroups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification has corrected all findings of noncompliance.</p> <p>The OSE-EIS verified that all findings of noncompliance were corrected within one year of notification, the district is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, and the district has corrected each individual case of noncompliance unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP's Memo 09-02.</p> <p>The OSE-EIS technical assistance provider verified through on-site visits completion of the district's corrective action plan activities which included the development of written procedures for eligibility for speech and language impairments (SLI) and</p>

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>both findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services, including those districts that had been previously identified during FFY 2008.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p> <p>OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State's definition of disproportionate representation and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.</p>	<p>subsequent staff trainings. Additionally, the technical assistance provider and the ISD monitor conducted a random review of records of students with a SLI and verified that all met requirements were documented per the new procedures. All areas of noncompliance were corrected and the district was closed out.</p> <p>The one district identified in FFY 2009 was not previously identified in FFY 2008.</p> <p>Michigan reviewed the improvement activities and determined that implementation of the current activities will ensure that the state is in compliance.</p>

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**Overview of Indicator 10 (Disproportionate Representation—Eligibility Categories) Report Development:**

1. See General Overview pages 3-7.
2. The Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services (OSE-EIS) used a weighted risk ratio (WRR) to calculate disproportionate representation for a school district when the district's population reflected the same racial/ethnic distribution as that of the state. A risk ratio (RR) was used instead of a WRR to determine disproportionate representation when the racial/ethnic distribution of the district's student population varied significantly from the state racial/ethnic distribution⁴⁰. This ratio was more appropriate because it compared identification rates by race/ethnicity with the district's student population. An alternate risk ratio (ARR) was used to determine disproportionate representation for a particular racial/ethnic subgroup when there were fewer than 10 students with disabilities in all other racial/ethnic subgroups (disability comparison subgroup). The OSE-EIS recognized that it was not appropriate to forego use of the ARR in favor of the RR.
3. *Procedures for Calculation of Local Educational Agency (LEA) Disproportionate Representation* was refined to provide greater clarity about the use of the WRR, RR and ARR.
4. Focused monitoring selection criteria were refined to identify districts that were candidates for monitoring activities due to data indicating disproportionate representation.

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation—Eligibility Categories

(Compliance Indicator)

Indicator 10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Measurement: Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2008, describe how the State made its annual determination that the disproportionate representation it identified (consider both over and under representation) of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a); e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all

⁴⁰ See Appendix C *Procedures for Calculation of LEA Disproportionate Representation* number 6 for further explanation.

racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum 'n' size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2008; i.e., after June 30, 2009. If inappropriate identification is identified, report on corrective actions taken.

Definition of Disproportionate Representation:

Michigan's operational definition of districts with disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification includes:

	Over-Representation	Under-Representation
Step 1: Identify Districts with Disproportionate Representation	For the FFY 2009 APR, the two school years considered were FFY 2008 (2008-2009) and FFY 2009 (2009-2010). A verified ratio ⁴¹ > 2.5 in two consecutive years for any race/ethnicity subgroup in a disability category was used to identify districts for focused monitoring activities.	For the FFY 2009 APR, the two school years considered were FFY 2008 (2008-2009) and FFY 2009 (2009-2010). A verified ratio <0.4 in two consecutive years for any race/ethnicity subgroup in a disability category was used to identify districts for focused monitoring activities.
Step 2: Analysis of Identification Policies, Procedures and Practices	<p>The OSE-EIS completed on-site focused monitoring visits for identified districts that had:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a verified ratio >3.0 for the second year, • a verified ratio between 2.75 and 3.0 for both years, or • a second year verified ratio that was higher than the first year ratio when the ratio for both years exceeded 2.5. <p>The OSE-EIS reviewed district processes and student records, and conducted interviews to determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of the district's identification policies, procedures or practices. This culminated in a focused monitoring report that included any findings of noncompliance.</p>	<p>The OSE-EIS conducted a desk audit that included a review of the Michigan Education Assessment Program (MEAP) student achievement data for districts with a verified ratio of <0.4 for two consecutive years. For those districts where the percentage of students in a given racial/ethnic group at the lowest MEAP proficiency level was higher than the overall district percentage of students in the lowest proficiency level, the OSE-EIS required a self-review of identification policies, procedures and practices. This culminated in a focused monitoring report that included any findings of</p>

⁴¹ In cases where the sum of all other students with disabilities equals fewer than ten, an ARR was calculated for the race under consideration, per Westat, Inc. recommendation. A RR was calculated when the racial/ethnic distribution of the district's student population varied significantly from the state racial distribution which was used to calculate WRRs/ARRs. The RR compared identification rates by race/ethnicity with the district's student population.

	Over-Representation	Under-Representation
	<p>All other districts above the threshold were required to complete a desk audit. The desk audit consisted of district staff, in collaboration with the intermediate school district (ISD) planner/monitor, completing a series of probe questions and reviewing student records to determine if the disproportionate representation was the result of the district's identification policies, procedures or practices. The OSE-EIS and select ISD monitors then reviewed the submitted desk audits and determined whether findings were to be issued. This culminated in a focused monitoring report that included any findings of noncompliance.</p> <p>Special considerations for the above focused monitoring activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Districts that were monitored in the fall of 2009 that had an active corrective action plan (CAP) were not required to participate in additional focused monitoring activities. The OSE-EIS provided technical assistance and oversight which ensured timely correction of the findings of noncompliance. • Districts that were monitored in the fall of 2009 and did not have findings of noncompliance were not required to participate in additional focused monitoring activities. • Districts that were monitored in the fall of 2008 and completed a CAP, which was verified by the OSE-EIS, participated in a follow-up interview to ensure the district was maintaining compliant identification policies, procedures and practices. 	<p>noncompliance.</p>

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2005	1.7%		
2006		0%	3.2%
2007		0%	1.7%
2008		0%	1.4%
2009		0%	0.9%*
Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the state)] times 100. $*[7 \div 755] \times 100$			

Sources: Michigan Compliance Information System (MI-CIS), the Single Record Student Database, and the Michigan Student Data System

During 2009-2010, the OSE-EIS analyzed FFY 2008 and FFY 2009 data for 755 districts; of those districts 144 were excluded from the disproportionate representation calculations because they had fewer than 30 students with disabilities enrolled. Based on the focused monitoring selection criteria, 56 districts were identified for a focused monitoring activity (13 with over-representation only, 37 with under-representation only and six with both over- and under-representation). Seven districts were found to have disproportionate over-representation due to inappropriate identification policies, procedures and practices. An additional six districts had disproportionate representation data, but had been monitored the previous year and were in their year of correction.

FFY 2009 Disproportionate Representation Analysis: Number and percent of districts by disability category and racial/ethnic group.

	American Indian		Asian		Black		Hispanic		White	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Autism Spectrum Disorder	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%
Cognitive Impairment	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Emotional Impairment	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Other Health Impairment	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.3%
Specific Learning Disability	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%
Speech and Language Impairment	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed

Timelines	Activities	Status
PROVIDE TRAINING/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT		
2007-2011	1. The OSE-EIS will provide professional development to ISD planner/monitors in order to address issues regarding disproportionate representation.	ISD planner/monitors with districts selected for focused monitoring activities participated in a workshop in September 2010 to develop the skills needed to implement monitoring and technical assistance activities for those districts. Additional support was provided via monthly Community of Practice (COP) webinars for ISD planner monitors, state monitors and technical assistance providers.
IMPROVE DATA COLLECTION		
2007-2011	2. The OSE-EIS will work with the Center for Educational Performance and Information to refine data collection issues	Because Michigan annually uses a two-year pattern of data to identify districts with disproportionate representation, a bridging methodology has been prepared

Timelines	Activities	Status
	and alignment with new Office of Management and Budget (OMB) multiracial/ethnic coding.	for data analysis and reporting for FFY 2009 to ensure that procedures are ready to accommodate the new required racial/ethnic codes in FFY 2010. MI-CIS, Michigan's special education child count collection source, inserted the necessary new codes for use during FFY 2009 so that Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) completed between December 1, 2009 and June 30, 2010 reflected the racial/ethnic codes required in FFY 2010.
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2006-2011	<p>3. Conduct ongoing literature reviews to identify the determinants and appropriate interventions for disproportionate representation.</p> <p>Study districts that in fact exhibit the determinants but do not have disproportionate representation issues.</p>	<p>The OSE-EIS continued to update the information available to school districts about research-based practices for eliminating disproportionate representation. This information is available on the Web page at: http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_6598_31834---,00.html) Web page information continues to be routinely shared through training offered to technical assistance providers.</p> <p>The OSE-EIS continued to review state assessment data for under-represented populations within identified districts to determine if there was a correlation between race/ethnicity, student achievement and identification for special education services.</p> <p>States shared methodologies and strategies with colleagues through the Education Information Management Advisory Consortium (EIMAC) special education subcommittee and North Central Resource Center conference calls.</p>
2006-2011	4. Meet semi-annually to recommend ways to analyze and address disproportionate representation data issues.	<p>The OSE-EIS data advisory committee continued to consider issues of disproportionate representation as one of its tasks.</p> <p>This advisory committee met three times during the FFY 2009, engaged in several</p>

Timelines	Activities	Status
		conference calls, and provided input on several documents.
2006-2011	5. Notify LEAs of their disproportionate representation status and the appropriate level of intervention to begin and complete the verification process.	<p>In June 2010, the OSE-EIS notified school districts of their disproportionate representation data for FFY 2008 and FFY 2009.</p> <p>The OSE-EIS worked with Wayne State University to develop a Web page for districts to verify and, if needed, recalculate data for FFY 2008 and FFY 2009.</p> <p>In August 2010, districts were notified of required fall 2010 monitoring activities through the CIMS electronic workbook.</p>
2007-2011	6. The OSE-EIS will annually review the calculations used to determine disproportionate representation and adjust the business rules based on district patterns analyzed to yield an increasingly accurate approach.	<p>The OSE-EIS reviewed the calculation used to determine disproportionate representation in order to begin the process of adjusting the calculation procedures. Specific areas of focus included the use of the seven racial/ethnic categories and residency issues regarding students participating in shared educational entities.</p> <p>The OSE-EIS continued to seek guidance regarding data issues during FFY 2009 from the national EIMAC special education subcommittee, the OSEP Data Managers group and at the OSEP Leadership Conference.</p>
IMPROVE COLLABORATION/COORDINATION		
2007-2011	7. Through Michigan's Integrated Improvement Initiatives (MI3), work with the OSE-EIS Family Involvement team, the Michigan Alliance for Families, ⁴² and the Citizen's Alliance to Uphold Special Education ⁴³ to prepare	The Michigan Alliance for Families provided training to parent mentors in five school districts during the FFY 2009 regarding the inappropriate identification of students as students with disabilities.

⁴² Michigan's Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) beginning 10/1/2009.

⁴³ Michigan's Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) through 9/30/2009.

Timelines	Activities	Status
	resources for parent mentors and educators to share with parents of students with disabilities throughout Michigan to enhance awareness of disproportionate representation issues and increase meaningful parent involvement in the education of children with disabilities.	
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT		
2007-2011	8. Use a listserv to distribute information about culturally proficient systems for LEA and ISD staff.	LEA and ISD staff members continued to implement the strategies of recognizing cultural bias and improving communication skills learned through participation in the Michigan Special Education Mediation Project training. The training sensitized mediators to cultural differences in order to improve the productivity of IEP team meetings and decisions about students' eligibility, programs and services.
2008-2011	9. Develop and implement a more integrated set of general supervision activities across: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The general supervision SPP indicators • MI3 • Michigan's emerging work with the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) General Supervision Framework 	Through involvement with CIMS, the OSE-EIS developed and implemented an integrated set of activities by aligning data collection, analysis, reporting, and corrective action activities across indicators. There are seven districts with findings of noncompliance. The findings were issued to the districts in the CIMS electronic workbook on December 15, 2010. The districts are required to submit a corrective action plan on or before February 15, 2011.

Timelines	Activities	Status
CLARIFY/EXAMINE/DEVELOP POLICIES AND PROCEDURES		
2007-2011	10. The OSE-EIS will convene a diverse advisory committee composed of general education and special education stakeholders, data experts, institutions of higher education faculty and members of professional organizations to meet semi-annually.	<p>The OSE-EIS data advisory committee continued to consider issues of disproportionate representation as one of its tasks.</p> <p>This advisory committee met three times during FFY 2009, engaged in several conference calls, and provided input on several documents.</p>
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2007-2011	11. Present information and gather input at conferences and key meetings with key stakeholder groups in order to enhance awareness of issues and prevention strategies, as well as necessary corrective actions.	<p>Representatives of the OSE-EIS participated in EIMAC, OSEP meetings and Regional Resource Center technical assistance calls. The OSE-EIS provided updates at special education administrative meetings. Additionally, presentations regarding the CIMS and focused monitoring lessons learned were provided at the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Michigan Council of Exceptional Children State Conference • Upper Peninsula Annual Conference • Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education⁴⁴ Summer Institute • Michigan Association of Public School Academies • Special Education Advisory Committee⁴⁵ • ISD planner/monitor meetings <p>ISD planner/monitor and state monitor and technical assistance providers monthly COP webinars.</p>
2007-2011	12. Design and maintain a Web page with resources and links to critical information on disproportionate representation.	<p>The OSE-EIS expanded the Web page found at:</p> <p>(http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-6530_6598_31834---,00.html)</p>

⁴⁴ Michigan's state affiliate of the National Council for Administrators of Special Education and the Council for Exceptional Children.

⁴⁵ Michigan's IDEA mandated special education State Advisory Panel.

Timelines	Activities	Status
		<p>The Web page included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • information about disproportionate representation including the <i>Procedures for Calculation of LEA Disproportionate Representation</i> • links to agencies and organizations that can assist school districts research best practice literature regarding disproportionate representation. <p>Information about the updated Web page was presented to monitoring teams for use during site visits and to technical assistance providers for dissemination to districts. It has been shared with all districts monitored for disproportionate representation.</p>
2007-2011	13. The OSE-EIS will prepare resource materials and develop and disseminate products, tools and training modules based on research-based results of effective Child Find interventions and identification practices.	Each district identified with findings was required to improve and correct Child Find strategies and interventions as part of the development of a CAP through the CIMS process.
2007-2011	14. The OSE-EIS will provide technical assistance regarding CAPs related to noncompliance and assist LEAs in revising policies, procedures and/or practices.	As part of the CIMS process, a technical assistance provider was assigned to each district identified with findings of noncompliance to assist with the development and implementation of CAPs to ensure appropriate policies, procedures and practices.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2009:

Michigan did not meet the zero percent target for Indicator 10 for FFY 2009. Of the 56 districts with data indicating over- or under-representation, only seven districts were identified with disproportionate representation due to over-representation as a result of inappropriate identification policies, procedures or practices. One district was identified because of over-representation of Hispanic students in the area of specific learning disability. Three districts were identified because of over-representation of White students; two with over-representation in the area of other health impairment and one in the area of autism spectrum disorder. Three districts were identified because of over-representation of Black students; one with over-

representation in the area of specific learning disability and two with over-representation in the area of cognitive impairment.

Six of the seven districts participated in onsite monitoring activities. Each of the six is developing a corrective action plan (CAP) with technical assistance provided by the OSE-EIS. The seventh district participated in a desk audit. As a result of the finding of noncompliance that arose from a review by the OSE-EIS of the desk audit, the district will receive technical assistance from OSE-EIS.

During FFY 2008, eleven districts were identified with disproportionate representation, this year only seven districts were identified.

Timely Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2008 (the period from July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009)	21 ⁴⁶
2. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	20
3. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	1

FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance and/or Not Corrected):

4. Number of FFY 2008 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	1
5. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	1
6. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance (See Indicator 15)

Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
8	10	46	District's evaluation policies, procedures and practices were not compliant with <i>Individuals with</i>	Finding Issued: January 12, 2009 as a result of a focused monitoring activity. Summary of Activities: The OSE-EIS required a CAP based

⁴⁶ As a result of the November 2007 OSEP verification visit, the OSEP follow-up guidance issued in September 2008 and the OSEP 09-02 memo issued 10/17/2008 the OSE-EIS began to issue findings to be corrected within one year, including verification for all instances of noncompliance. The FFY 2008 APR reflected only findings based on the data year(s) typically reported in the FFY 2008 APR. Districts were monitored for multiple data years (2006-2007 and 2007-2008, 2007-2008 and 2008-2009) during FFY 2008.

Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
			<i>Disabilities Education Act.</i>	on a root cause analysis. Increased state supervision and technical assistance were provided. Status: Corrected Verified by: OSE-EIS technical assistance provider on May 12, 2010.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2009

Timelines	New and Revised Activities	Justification
2007-2011	<i>Deletion of Activity #7:</i> Through Michigan's Integrated Improvement Initiatives (MI3), work with the OSE-EIS Family Involvement team, the Michigan Alliance for Families, and the Citizen's Alliance to Uphold Special Education to prepare resources for parent mentors and educators to share with parents of students with disabilities throughout Michigan to enhance awareness of disproportionate representation issues and increase meaningful parent involvement in the education of children with disabilities.	Educating parent mentors was not found to lead to improved policies, procedures or practices for the identification of students with disabilities. This activity has been discontinued.

Michigan Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 1.4 percent. These data represent	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2009 APR demonstrating compliance. Because the State reported	All districts identified in FFY 2008 as having disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic subgroups in specific disability categories

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>progress from the FFY 2007 data of 1.7 percent. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 0 percent.</p> <p>The State reported that 76 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported that 11 districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State reported that all findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 for this indicator were corrected.</p> <p>The State reported that all 17 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>less than 100 percent compliance for FFY 2008 (greater than 0 percent actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the districts identified in FFY 2008 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100 percent compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must</p>	<p>that was the result of inappropriate identification have corrected all findings of noncompliance.</p> <p>The OSE-EIS verified that all findings of noncompliance were corrected within one year of notification, the districts are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, and the districts have corrected each individual case of noncompliance unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP's Memo 09-02.</p> <p>The OSE-EIS technical assistance provider verified through on-site visits completion of the district's corrective action plan activities which included the development of written procedures for eligibility for speech and language impairments (SLI) and subsequent staff trainings. Additionally, the technical assistance provider and the intermediate school</p>

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
	<p>describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p> <p>OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State's definition of disproportionate representation and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.</p>	<p>district monitor conducted a random review of records of students with SLI and verified that all met requirements were documented per the new procedures. All areas of noncompliance were corrected and verified.</p> <p>Michigan reviewed the improvement activities and determined that implementation of the current activities will ensure that the state is in compliance.</p>

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**Overview of Indicator 11 (Child Find) Report Development:**

1. See General Overview pages 3-7.
2. The Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services (OSE-EIS) intensified collaborative efforts within and across its units to collect and verify data, disseminate accurate information and provide technical assistance to all stakeholders about Child Find and the timely completion of the initial evaluation and Individualized Education Program (IEP).

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision/Child Find (Compliance Indicator)

Indicator 11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

Account for children included in a but not included in b. Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2005	80.5% ⁴⁷		
2006		100%	96.2%
2007		100%	87.1%
2008		100%	95.3%
2009		100%	99.1%*
Percent = [(# of children whose evaluations were completed within 30 school days or agreed upon extension) divided by (# of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received)] times 100.			
*[25,179 ÷ 25,414] X 100			

Source: Michigan Student Data System (MSDS)

⁴⁷ Based on the OSEP approved cohort with data from one-third of the state. Since that time Michigan has moved to a statewide data collection.

Analysis of Child Find Data for FFY 2008 – FFY 2009

	FFY 2008	FFY 2009
(a) # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.	35,323	25,414
(b) # of children whose evaluations were completed within 30 school days or a mutually agreed upon extension.	33,653	25,179
# of children included in (a) but not included in (b).	1,670	235

Source: MSDS

For the late IEPs, the following table presents the reasons districts gave and the number and percent of eligible and ineligible children reported for each reason.

Reason for Late IEP	Eligible Children with Late IEPs	Ineligible Children with Late IEPs
Personnel unavailable to complete within timeline	84 (41.2%)	16 (51.6%)
Required external evaluation/report delayed	72 (35.3%)	10 (32.3%)
Other	48 (23.5%)	5 (16.1%)

Source: MSDS

For the late IEPs, the number of days beyond the required 30 school day timeline⁴⁸ (or agreed upon extension) ranged from one day to 156 days. The following table presents the number and percent of late IEPs by range of days late.

Range of Days Beyond 30	Number (Percent) of Late IEPs
1-5 days	65 (27.7%)
6-10 days	53 (22.6%)
11-15 days	34 (14.5%)
16-20 days	18 (7.7%)
21-25 days	10 (4.3%)
26-30 days	13 (5.5%)
> 30 days	42 (17.9%)

Source: MSDS

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed

Timelines	Activities	Status
IMPROVE DATA COLLECTION		
2007-2011	1. Revise all necessary data fields to gather required information for future APRs.	<p>New components and characteristics were implemented specific to the collection of data about the initial evaluation and IEP for use in the MSDS in the fall of 2009, replacing the Single Record Student Database (SRSD).</p> <p>The new MSDS components and characteristics clarify the distinction between compliant and noncompliant initial evaluations and the reasons for late evaluations. The components and characteristics were developed with input from stakeholders.</p>

⁴⁸ Michigan's state established timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted per Michigan Administrative Rules for Special Education.

Timelines	Activities	Status
IMPROVE COLLABORATION/COORDINATION		
2007-2011	2. Continue to collaborate with workgroups to review and update, as necessary, Michigan's Child Find process.	Several work groups were convened in collaboration with the Michigan's Integrated Improvement Initiatives (MI3), including parent training and advocacy groups. These work groups continued to clarify federal and state Child Find requirements and developed guidance for dissemination to stakeholders.
CLARIFY/EXAMINE/DEVELOP POLICIES AND PROCEDURES		
2006-2011	3. Establish and maintain a work group to completely revise Michigan's Child Find process. Include, at minimum, stakeholders from special education, general education, early childhood education, safe schools, community service providers, agency service providers, the health field, institutions of higher education (including community colleges) and the community at large.	<p>A Child Find policy communication work group, a policy and procedures manual work group, a Child Find corrective action plan (CAP) review team, and a program accountability advisory team were convened throughout FFY 2009 to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • review state guidance for accuracy • clarify state guidance and • communicate to stakeholders state guidance about the <i>Individuals with Disabilities Education Act</i> and the <i>Michigan Administrative Rules for Special Education</i> (MARSE) Child Find requirements. <p>Additionally, the CAP review team directly communicated Child Find system requirements to local districts through the Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System (CIMS) communication network.</p>
2008-2011	4. Develop and implement a more integrated set of general supervision activities across: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The General Supervision indicators • MI3 • Michigan's redesigned monitoring system (CIMS-2) 	The OSE-EIS policy staff led an integrated effort to disseminate accurate information regarding federal regulations and state rule requirements for completion of the initial evaluation and IEP

Timelines	Activities	Status
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2006-2011	5. Disseminate information on the modifications to the data collection system and the data collection requirements to the field in the form of data collection manuals and technical assistance models.	The OSE-EIS Performance Reporting Unit continued to work collaboratively with the Center for Educational Performance and Information and the Michigan Pupil Accounting and Attendance Association to provide local districts with technical assistance to improve data accuracy.
2008-2010	6. Provide training, technical assistance and support through the redesigned monitoring system (CIMS-2), the complaint system and the district Determinations process to all districts regarding federal regulation and state rule requirements in the identification of initial evaluations and the use of timeline extensions.	The training and technical assistance developed through the redesigned CIMS process was embedded in the state's monitoring system. This specific activity is complete.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2009:

Michigan did not meet the Indicator 11 target of 100 percent compliance. However, there was a 3.8 percent increase between FFY 2008 (95.3 percent) and FFY 2009 (99.1 percent). All of the 235 children with late IEPs had IEPs developed and implemented during the 2009-2010 school year.

For FFY 2009, Michigan continued to improve technical assistance through the OSE-EIS PA Unit and data collection through the MSDS. Through the CIMS, districts were provided with ongoing support, technical assistance and access to current and consistent information in an effort to ensure accuracy in identifying initial evaluations and calculating appropriate timelines. A system of coordinated presentations clarifying the specific requirements in MARSE for completing the initial evaluation and IEP were presented to a wide range of stakeholders during FFY 2009. A review of data through the CIMS indicates the absence of specific written procedures for implementing a child find process and lack of personnel (primarily speech pathologists) as the reasons most often responsible for late initials. When the number of days late was short, one to 10 days, the reasons cited included poor scheduling and unexpected circumstances (e.g., illness of the student).

Timely Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2008 (the period from July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009)	533
2. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the local educational agency (LEA) of the finding)	467
3. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	66 ⁴⁹

FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance and/or Not Corrected):

4. Number of FFY 2008 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	66
5. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	60
6. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	6

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance (See Indicator 15)

Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
9	11	57	The district did not complete all initial IEPs within the state timeline.	<p>Finding Issued: September 16, 2008 based on an OSE-EIS data review.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: Based on a subsequent data review an additional finding was issued on April 15, 2009.</p> <p>The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports.</p> <p>Status: Corrected</p>

⁴⁹ As a result of the November 2007 OSEP verification visit, the OSEP follow-up guidance issued in September 2008 and the OSEP 09-02 memo issued 10/17/2008 the OSE-EIS began to issue findings to be corrected within one year, including verification for all instances of noncompliance. The FFY 2008 APR reflected only findings based on the data year(s) typically reported in the FFY 2008 APR. Findings of non-compliance were issued twice during FFY 2008 for data years 2006-2007 and 2007-2008.

Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
				Verified by: Data review on February 16, 2010.
10-11	11	19, 23	The district did not complete all initial IEPs within the state timeline.	<p>Finding Issued: September 16, 2008 based on an OSE-EIS data review.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: Based on a subsequent data review an additional finding was issued on April 15, 2009.</p> <p>The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. Repeated data reviews were conducted until 100% compliant.</p> <p>Status: Corrected Verified by: Data review on March 9, 2010.</p>
12-16	11	14, 21, 26, 31, 41	The district did not complete all initial IEPs within the state timeline.	<p>Findings Issued: September 16, 2008 based on OSE-EIS data reviews.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: Based on a subsequent data review an additional finding was issued on April 15, 2009.</p> <p>The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports.</p> <p>Required participation in Child Find training, technical assistance, and repeated data reviews until 100 percent compliant.</p> <p>Status: Corrected Verified by: Data review on October 10, 2010.</p>
17	11	47	The district did not complete all initial IEPs within the state timeline.	<p>Finding Issued: September 16, 2008 based on OSE-EIS data reviews.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: Based on a subsequent data review</p>

Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
				<p>an additional finding was issued on April 15, 2009.</p> <p>The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. Required participation in Child Find training, technical assistance, and repeated data reviews until 100 percent compliant.</p> <p>Status: Corrected Verified by: Data review on October 31, 2010.</p>
18-23	11	6, 37, 38, 39, 42, 56	The district did not complete all initial IEPs within the state timeline.	<p>Findings Issued: September 16, 2008 based on OSE-EIS data reviews.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: Based on a subsequent data review, additional findings were issued on April 15, 2009.</p> <p>The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. The OSE-EIS also required participation in Child Find training, technical assistance, and repeated data reviews until 100 percent compliant. Given the continued noncompliance, districts were directed to convene a Review and Analysis Process Team to review prior year's instances of untimely initial IEPs and submit data for the period of September 7 to November 15, 2010.</p> <p>Status: Corrected Verified by: Data review on January 18, 2011.</p>
24	11	16	The district did not complete all initial IEPs within the state timeline.	<p>Finding Issued: September 16, 2008 based on OSE-EIS data reviews.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: Based on a subsequent data review,</p>

Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
				<p>an additional finding was issued on April 15, 2009.</p> <p>The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. The OSE-EIS also required participation in Child Find training, technical assistance, and repeated data reviews until 100 percent compliant. Given the continued noncompliance, districts were directed to convene a Review and Analysis Process Team to review prior year's instances of untimely initial IEPs and submit data for the period of September 7 to November 15, 2010. This was due on January 14, 2011 and data were not at 100 percent compliant.</p> <p>Increased state supervision continues, and new data will be required for the period of November 15, 2010 to January 31, 2011.</p> <p>Status: Uncorrected</p>
25-28	11	30, 32, 34, 62	The district did not complete all initial IEPs within the state timeline.	<p>Findings Issued: April 15, 2009 based on an OSE-EIS data review.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. The OSE-EIS required participation in Child Find training, technical assistance, and repeated data reviews until 100 percent compliant.</p> <p>Status: Corrected Verified by: Data review on May 14, 2010.</p>
29-30	11	12, 28	The district did not complete all initial IEPs within the state timeline.	<p>Findings Issued: April 15, 2009 based on an OSE-EIS data review.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and</p>

Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
				<p>submission of progress reports. The OSE-EIS required participation in Child Find training, technical assistance, and repeated data reviews until 100 percent compliant.</p> <p>Status: Corrected Verified by: Data review on June 9, 2010.</p>
31-51	11	3, 4, 5, 9, 14, 15, 21, 24, 26, 27, 31, 36, 40, 41, 48, 50, 51, 54, 59, 61, 66	The district did not complete all initial IEPs within the state timeline.	<p>Findings Issued: April 15, 2009 based on an OSE-EIS data review.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. The OSE-EIS required participation in Child Find training, technical assistance, and repeated data reviews until 100 percent compliant.</p> <p>Status: Corrected Verified by: Data review on October 20, 2010.</p>
52-58	11	1, 18, 20, 25, 45, 47, 49	The district did not complete all initial IEPs within the state timeline.	<p>Findings Issued: April 15, 2009 based on an OSE-EIS data review.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. The OSE-EIS required participation in Child Find training, technical assistance, and repeated data reviews until 100 percent compliant.</p> <p>Status: Corrected Verified by: Data review on October 31, 2010.</p>
59	11	13	The district did not complete all initial IEPs within the state timeline.	<p>Finding Issued: April 15, 2009 based on an OSE-EIS data review.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. The OSE-EIS required participation in</p>

Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
				<p>Child Find training, technical assistance, and repeated data reviews until 100 percent compliant.</p> <p>Status: Corrected Verified by: Data review on November 12, 2010.</p>
60	11	63	The district did not complete all initial IEPs within the state timeline.	<p>Finding Issued: April 15, 2009 based on an OSE-EIS data review.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. The OSE-EIS required participation in Child Find training, technical assistance, and repeated data reviews until 100 percent compliant.</p> <p>Status: Corrected Verified by: Data review on November 17, 2010.</p>
61-69	11	6, 33, 37, 39, 42, 53, 58, 64, 65	The district did not complete all initial IEPs within the state timeline.	<p>Findings Issued: April 15, 2009 based on an OSE-EIS data review.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. The OSE-EIS required participation in Child Find training, technical assistance, and repeated data reviews until 100 percent compliant. Given the continued noncompliance, districts were directed to convene a Review and Analysis Process Team to review prior year's instances of untimely initial IEPs and submit data for the period of September 7 to November 15, 2010.</p> <p>Status: Corrected Verified by: Data review on January 18, 2011.</p>
70-74	11	7, 16, 38, 55, 56	The district did not complete all initial IEPs within the	<p>Findings Issued: April 15, 2009 based on an OSE-EIS data review.</p>

Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
			state timeline.	<p>Summary of Activities: The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. The OSE-EIS required participation in Child Find training, technical assistance, and repeated data reviews until 100 percent compliant. Given the continued noncompliance, districts were directed to convene a Review and Analysis Process Team to review prior year's instances of untimely initial IEPs and submit data for the period of September 7 to November 15, 2010. This was due on January 14, 2011 and data were not at 100 percent. Increased state supervision and technical assistance continues and new data are required for the period of November 15, 2010 to January 31, 2011.</p> <p>Status: Uncorrected</p>

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2009

None required at this time.

Michigan Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and OSEP accepts those revisions.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). Because the State reported less than 100 percent compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of	Michigan reviewed the improvement activities and determined that implementation of current activities will ensure that the state is in

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 95.3 percent. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 87.1 percent. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100 percent.</p> <p>The State reported that ten of 11 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining finding subsequently was corrected by October 28, 2009.</p> <p>The State reported that 338 of 388 findings of noncompliance identified in April 2009 based on FFY 2007 data were corrected in a timely manner. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p>	<p>noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100 percent compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR that the remaining 50 uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2008 based on FFY 2007 data were corrected.</p> <p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2008 data the State reported for this indicator and the LEAs with the remaining 50 uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2008 based on FFY 2007 data: (1) are correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (i.e., achieved 100 percent compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) have completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify correction.</p>	<p>compliance.</p> <p>Of the FFY 2008 uncorrected noncompliance findings, (1) all except six districts are correctly implementing 34 CFR § 300.301 (c)(1) (i.e., achieved 100 percent compliance) based on a review of updated data including data subsequently collected through the state data system and district assurance of completion of all CAP activities; and (2) all have completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the local district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p>

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**Overview of Indicator 12 (Early Childhood Transition) Report Development:**

1. See General Overview pages 3-7.
2. The FFY 2009 data collection was statewide for the fourth year.

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision/Early Childhood Transition

(Compliance Indicator)

Indicator 12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an Individualized Education Program (IEP) developed and implemented by their third birthdays. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.
- e. # of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.

Account for children included in a but not included in b, c, d or e. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e)] times 100.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2005	92.1%		
2006		100%	91.5%
2007		100%	93.9%
2008		100%	97.8%
2009		100%	98.7%*
Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e)] times 100.			
*[4,252 ÷ (4,647 - 144 - 35 - 158)] X 100			

Sources: Michigan Compliance Information System (MI-CIS), data verification survey

Analysis of Early Childhood Transition Data for FFY 2008 – FFY 2009

	FFY 2008	FFY 2009
a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination.	3,348	4,647
b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays.	23	144
c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	3,176	4,252
d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.	44	35
e. # of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	34	158

Sources: MI-CIS, data verification survey

The following table presents the reasons districts gave for late IEPs and the number of eligible and ineligible children reported with each reason:

Reason for Late IEP	Number of Eligible Children with Late IEPs	Number of Ineligible Children with Late IEPs
Late notification from Part C (less than 90 days before third birthday)	4	0
Unable to arrange mutually agreeable evaluation/IEP times	14	1
Personnel unavailable to complete within timeline	7	0
Required external evaluation/report delayed	0	0
Child's health problems limited access	0	0
Other*	21	1
Unknown	8	2
Total	54	4

*Reasons reported under the category "other" were lack of understanding of transition requirements, lack of staff training and extenuating family circumstances.

The following table presents the number of districts with late IEPs:

Number of Late IEPs	Number of Districts
1	27
2 - 3	10
≥ 4	1

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed

Timelines	Activities	Status
PROVIDE TRAINING/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT		
2009-2011	1. The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) will work with the Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System redesign (CIMS-2) system, districts and EOT&TA to develop and monitor transition training and technical assistance activities from Part C to Part B.	<p>In partnership with the Office of Early Childhood Education and Family Services (ECE&FS) staff, <i>Early On</i>[®] Training and Technical Assistance (EOT&TA) developed and delivered technical assistance activities for Part C field staff regarding transition from Part C to Part B. This technical assistance was incorporated into scheduled conferences, individual district workshops and technical assistance.</p> <p>EOT&TA and personnel from the Office of ECE&FS conducted joint visits to districts with noncompliance to provide training and conduct student record reviews to verify correction of instances of noncompliance.</p>
IMPROVE DATA COLLECTION		
2009-2010	2. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collect data in the new fields during December collection. Verify accuracy with LEA feedback. Collect and verify self review data. Collaborate with the ECE&FS in order to improve transition from Part C to Part B services. 	<p>All activities have been completed in collaboration with the Office of ECE&FS to verify data and improve transition from Part C to Part B services.</p> <p>A referent group was convened following FFY 2008 data verification to ensure improvement in the data collection and verification process.</p>
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2007-2011	3. Identify LEAs determined to be out of compliance and target for technical assistance and appropriate corrective action.	Using FFY 2008 data, the process of identifying districts out of compliance began during the reporting year. The actions taken to address instances of noncompliance are described in the Correction of FFY 2008 Noncompliance section. This indicator was included as an element in the 2010 Part B district determinations.

Timelines	Activities	Status
IMPROVE COLLABORATION/COORDINATION		
2008-2011	<p>4. Develop and implement a more integrated set of activities across:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The FAPE in the LRE SPP indicators • The Michigan's State Personnel Development Grant, Michigan's Integrated Improvement Initiatives (MI3) • Michigan's emerging work with the NCSEAM General Supervision Framework 	<p>This indicator was included in the Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System (CIMS).</p> <p>The Office of ECE&FS developed two subgrants to provide technical assistance, professional development and data analysis reporting.</p>

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2009:

Michigan did not meet the 100 percent target for Indicator 12; however the state continues to make progress. The FFY 2009 compliance rate of 98.7 percent represents an improvement of 0.90 percent from 2008-2009 (97.8 percent) and an increase of 6.6 percent from the 2004-2005 baseline (92.1 percent).

In 2009-2010, 4,647 children being served in Part C were referred to Part B for eligibility determination. Of these children, 58 had late IEPs. These were distributed across 38 districts (from 35 of Michigan's 57 ISDs). Among the 35 ISDs with late IEPs, most had one to three late IEPs. The range of days for late IEP development and implementation was from 1 to 223 days. Most IEPs were developed and implemented within 60 days of the child's third birthday with 223 days being a single outlier in the range of days. All of the 58 children with late IEPs had IEPs developed and implemented during the 2009-2010 year. Districts identified reasons for noncompliance using the following reporting categories: late notification from Part C; unable to arrange mutually agreeable time; personnel unavailable; and required external evaluation delayed.

Progress was largely due to the increased capacity of the OSE-EIS and the Office of ECE&FS to identify and ensure correction of noncompliance, districts' efforts to increase awareness, training and technical assistance throughout the state and increased collaboration between the Part C and Part B systems. Many programs were unaware of obligations to report children not eligible for Part B services or of

the exemption of reporting children referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthday. As a result of training and technical assistance, many more children were reported as being referred and found not eligible for FFY 2009 (n=144) than FFY 2008 (n=23) and many more children were reported as being referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthday for FFY 2009 (n=158) than FFY 2008 (n=34), resulting in fewer late IEPs. Further, the CIMS process notified districts of noncompliance, offered tools for systemic data improvement, and developed a process for locals to improve the transition process. Many ISDs developed plans and interagency agreements leading to stronger compliance and improving the transition of children from Part C to Part B.

The children included in category a, but not included in b, c, d or e represent those whose IEPs were implemented after their third birthdays. During data verification, the MDE learned that some districts did not have clear procedures and protocols for the transition between Part C exit and Part B entry. Based upon data verification, districts receiving findings of noncompliance for Part C to Part B transition were required to complete a corrective action plan (CAP) process to ensure correction. All identified noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year, and verified by the state within that year.

Timely Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State made during FFY 2008 (the period from July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009)	109
2. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	104
3. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	5 ⁵⁰

FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance and/or Not Corrected):

4. Number of FFY 2008 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	5
5. Number of FFY 2008 findings the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	5
6. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	0

⁵⁰ As a result of the November 2007 OSEP verification visit, the OSEP follow-up guidance issued in September 2008 and the OSEP 09-02 memo issued 10/17/2008 the OSE-EIS began to issue findings to be corrected within one year, including verification for all instances of noncompliance. The FFY 2008 APR reflected only findings based on the data year(s) typically reported in the FFY 2008 APR. Findings of non-compliance were issued twice during FFY 2008 for data years 2006-2007 and 2007-2008.

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance (See Indicator 15)

Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
75	12	22	The district did not hold IEPs prior to the third birthday for those children transitioning from Part C to Part B programs and services.	<p>Finding Issued: September 16, 2008 based on an OSE-EIS data review.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: Based on a subsequent data review, an additional finding was issued on April 15, 2009. The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. Increased state supervision and technical assistance were provided. The MDE repeated data reviews until 100 percent compliant.</p> <p>Status: Corrected Verified by: Data review on December 9, 2009.</p>
76	12	17	The district did not hold IEPs prior to the third birthday for those children transitioning from Part C to Part B programs and services.	<p>Finding Issued: September 16, 2008 based on an OSE-EIS data review.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: Based on a subsequent data review, an additional finding was issued on April 15, 2009. The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. Increased state supervision and technical assistance were provided. The MDE repeated data reviews until 100 percent compliant.</p> <p>Status: Corrected Verified by: Data review on December 16, 2009.</p>
77-79	12	39, 43, 55	The district did not hold IEPs prior to the third birthday for those children transitioning from Part C to Part B programs and services.	<p>Findings Issued: September 16, 2008 based on an OSE-EIS data review.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: Based on a subsequent data review, an additional finding was issued on April 15, 2009. The OSE-</p>

Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
				<p>EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. Increased state supervision and technical assistance were provided. The MDE repeated data reviews until 100 percent compliant.</p> <p>Status: Corrected Verified by: Data review on September 15, 2010.</p>

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2009

None required at this time.

Michigan Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 97.8 percent. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 93.9 percent. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b). Because the State reported less than 100 percent compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100 percent compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR that the remaining three uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2008 based on FFY 2007 data were corrected.</p>	<p>Michigan reviewed the improvement activities and determined that implementation of the current activities will ensure that the state is in compliance.</p> <p>The remaining three uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2008 based on FFY 2007 data were corrected. The OSE-EIS has verified that all districts with noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2008 based on</p>

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>of 100 percent.</p> <p>The State reported that 102 of 105 findings of noncompliance identified in April 2009 based on FFY 2007 data were corrected in a timely manner. The State reported on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance.</p>	<p>When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2008 data the State reported for this indicator and the LEAs with the remaining three uncorrected noncompliance findings identified in FFY 2008 based on FFY 2007 data: (1) are correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b) (i.e., achieved 100 percent compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) have developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>	<p>FFY 2007 data: (1) are correctly implementing 34 CFR § 300.124(b) (i.e., achieved 100 percent compliance) based on a review of updated data including data subsequently collected through the state data system; and assurance of completion of all CAP activities and (2) have developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for all children for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p>

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

1. See SPP General Overview pages 1-8.
2. In March 2009 the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) designated Indicator 13 as a new indicator, revising the indicator language and measurement.
3. This required states to establish a new baseline in the FFY 2009 SPP.
4. The previous SPP section for this indicator is included in Appendix K as a historical reference.

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision / Secondary Transition

(Compliance Indicator)

Indicator 13: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = $\left[\left(\frac{\text{\# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority}}{\text{\# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above}} \right) \times 100 \right]$

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:Sample

Michigan's sample of IEPs for Indicator 13 data collection is drawn from the annual special education child count. Any student with an IEP age 16-21 in this count is included in the eligible population for sampling. The sampling frame uses a 90 percent response distribution assumption and a 5-10 percent margin of error to determine each district's sample size:

- Any district with fewer than 50,000 enrolled students is sampled annually to achieve a margin of error within plus or minus 10 percent at the 95 percent confidence level.
- Any district with 50,000 or more enrolled students is sampled annually to achieve a margin of error within plus or minus 5 percent at the 95 percent confidence level.

Data Collection

The intermediate school district (ISD) transition coordinators, with the local district counterparts, are trained to collect and analyze these data, complete data report-out sessions, and develop and implement corrective action plans (CAPs). Data collection begins April 1 and ends on October 1. IEP reviews are completed by district and ISD staff, and data are entered through a secure Web-based system.

An IEP review must determine that each of the following six elements is included in the IEP to comply with Indicator 13 requirements (see Appendix L for a sample of the Compliance Checklist for Secondary Transition):

1. The student was invited to the IEP Team meeting.
2. The student's postsecondary vision (postsecondary goals) is identified, including:
 - a. Development/update of the postsecondary vision (postsecondary goals) was based upon evidence of current transition assessment information;
 - b. Evidence the postsecondary vision (postsecondary goals) was updated annually; and
 - c. The postsecondary vision (postsecondary goals) is measurable.
3. The IEP identifies current student:
 - a. Academic achievement;
 - b. Functional performance; and
 - c. Transition related needs.
4. The IEP identifies transition services (including courses of study) that align with the postsecondary vision (postsecondary goals).
5. If any agency is likely to provide/pay for specified transition services, there must be evidence that:
 - a. Prior consent to invite any agency(s) was obtained from parent (or student if s/he has reached age of majority).
 - b. A representative from identified agency(s) was invited to the IEP Team meeting.
6. The IEP identifies at least one measurable annual IEP goal aligned with the postsecondary vision (postsecondary goals).

Analysis

Because there is a gap between the annual special education child count date and the date that the IEP is audited for compliance with Indicator 13 requirements, students who are no longer receiving services in the district in which they were sampled are removed from the sample (e.g., if the student moved to another district, exited special education or graduated since the child count date). The ISD

transition coordinators and their local district counterparts enter this information using the secure Web-based data collection system.

After removing students who are no longer in the district, the sample is checked for representativeness against the known population of students with IEPs eligible for Indicator 13 review (including age, race/ethnicity, gender, and primary disability). The differences in proportions test (z-test) is used to look for any variation between the final sample and the known population of students with IEPs (at the state level, and for each district with 50,000 or more enrolled students). A 95 percent confidence level is used to determine significance, and any statistically significant variation ($p < .05$) is noted. For any demographic categories where a significant difference is identified, post-stratification weights are applied for comparison of results.

Correction of noncompliance

Districts with IEPs that are not compliant with the Indicator 13 requirements as of October 1, are issued a finding of noncompliance on December 15. Districts are required to convene a Review and Analysis Process team, identify the root cause of the noncompliance, and develop and submit a corrective action plan (CAP) by February 15. All CAPs are reviewed for approval. A progress report is due on June 1, and evidence of correction is due by September 15. Once the OSE-EIS verifies completion of the CAP activities and correction of the student-level noncompliance, the CAP will be closed and a closeout letter will be issued on December 15.

Baseline Data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):

Using the sampling frame described above, an initial sample of 11,839 IEPs were randomly selected for review. Of these, 3,118 were removed from the sample because the student was no longer receiving special education services in the sampled district; this resulted in a final sample of 8,721 IEPs.

Among the 8,721 IEPs reviewed for Indicator 13 compliance, there were 6,483 compliant records. Therefore, Michigan's baseline FFY 2009 Indicator 13 compliance rate was 74.3 percent.

FFY 2009 Indicator 13 Compliance Rate			
FFY	N	# Compliant Records	Compliance Rate
2009	8,721	6,483	74.3%
$[6,483 \div 8,721] \times 100 = 74.3\%$			

Source: Checklist data from Public Sector Consultants

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The review of IEPs found that 6,483 IEPs were compliant with Indicator 13, for an FFY 2009 baseline of 74.3 percent $[(6,483 \div 8,721) \times 100 = 74.3\%]$.

Representativeness of sample

The final sample of 8,721 IEPs was checked for representativeness (for age, race/ethnicity, gender and disability) against the population of eligible students from the annual special education child count. A difference in proportions z-test was used to determine if the sample varied significantly from the population of eligible students. This test was done at the state level and for Michigan's only district with more than 50,000 enrolled students.

There were no significant differences between the population of eligible students and the final Indicator 13 sample for the district with more than 50,000 students in any demographic category.

As shown in the table on the following page, there were significant differences between the population of eligible students and the final Indicator 13 sample for certain ages, racial/ethnic groups, and disabilities at the state level.

Comparison of Population and Sample (state level)				
	Special Education Child Count N	Special Education Child Count Percent	Sample N	Sample Percent
Gender				
Male	29,236	65.5%	5,768	66.1%
Female	15,410	34.5%	2,953	33.9%
Age				
Age 16*	16,476	36.9%	3,844	44.1%
Age 17	14,940	33.5%	2,879	33.0%
Age 18*	8,111	18.2%	1,269	14.6%
Age 19*	2,569	5.8%	380	4.4%
Age 20*	1,459	3.3%	189	2.2%
Age 21*	1,091	2.4%	160	1.8%
Race/Ethnicity				
American Indian*	539	1.2%	137	1.6%
Asian	416	0.9%	70	0.8%
Black*	11,253	25.2%	1,283	14.7%
Hispanic	1,866	4.2%	338	3.9%
White*	30,572	68.5%	6,893	79.0%
Disability Category				
Autism Spectrum	2,628	5.9%	537	6.2%

Comparison of Population and Sample (state level)				
	Special Education Child Count N	Special Education Child Count Percent	Sample N	Sample Percent
Disorder				
Cognitive Impairment*	7,603	17.0%	1,351	15.5%
Deaf-Blindness	4	0.0%	1	0.0%
Emotional Impairment*	4,586	10.3%	740	8.5%
Hearing Impairment	560	1.3%	114	1.3%
Other Health Impairment*	4,391	9.8%	930	10.7%
Physical Impairment	579	1.3%	120	1.4%
Severe Multiple Impairment*	1,120	2.5%	183	2.1%
Specific Learning Disability*	22,035	49.4%	4,561	52.3%
Speech & Language Impairment	757	1.7%	124	1.4%
Traumatic Brain Injury	214	0.5%	37	0.4%
Visual Impairment	169	0.4%	23	0.3%

* Difference between special education child count population and sample is statistically significant ($p < .05$).

The significant variation in the sample percent compared to the population percent for these demographic categories can be partially explained by the data collection protocol that removes students who are no longer receiving services in their sampled district; e.g., the number of graduating students removed from the sample. If the representativeness of the final sample is similarly affected on the 2011 checklist, the state will submit a revised sampling protocol to OSEP for approval.

Weighting

Weights are commonly used to adjust survey results for under- and over-representation of specific subgroups in a sample population. Weighting provides an estimate of the results that would be found if the distribution of a particular characteristic in the sample were identical to the distribution in the overall population. For any demographic category that varied significantly, post-stratification weighting was used to compute a weighted compliance rate. The table below shows the weights used to compute the post-stratification weight. Weights were calculated by dividing the percent of each demographic category in the eligible population from the child count by the corresponding percent in the final Indicator 13 sample. [Child Count Percent ÷ Sample Percent = Weight]

Weights for Statistically Significant Demographic Categories (state level)					
	Special Education Child Count N	Special Education Child Count Percent	Sample N	Sample Percent	Weight
Age					
Age 16	16,476	36.9%	3,844	44.1%	0.8372
Age 18	8,111	18.2%	1,269	14.6%	1.2485
Age 19	2,569	5.8%	380	4.4%	1.3206
Age 20	1,459	3.3%	189	2.2%	1.5079
Age 21	1,091	2.4%	160	1.8%	1.3320
Race/Ethnicity					
American Indian	539	1.2%	137	1.6%	0.7685
Black	11,253	25.2%	1,283	14.7%	1.7133
White	30,572	68.5%	6,893	79.0%	0.8664
Disability Category					
Cognitive Impairment	7,603	17.0%	1,351	15.5%	1.0993
Emotional Impairment	4,586	10.3%	740	8.5%	1.2106
Other Health Impairment	4,391	9.8%	930	10.7%	0.9223
Severe Multiple Impairment	1,120	2.5%	183	2.1%	1.1955
Specific Learning Disability	22,035	49.4%	4,561	52.3%	0.9437

Michigan's unweighted baseline FFY 2009 Indicator 13 compliance rate of 74.3 percent was then compared to weighted results for each of the demographic categories (age, race/ethnicity, disability). As shown in the table below, although the representativeness of the sample varied for these demographic categories, weighted results were not significantly different than unweighted results.

FFY 2009 Indicator 13 Weighted and Unweighted Compliance Rates (state level)			
	N	# Compliant Records	Compliance Rate
Age (Weighted)	8,682	6,485	74.7%
Race/Ethnicity (Weighted)	8,683	6,464	74.4%
Disability (Weighted)	8,718	6,481	74.3%
[(# Compliant Records ÷ N) x 100 = Compliance Rate]			
UNWEIGHTED DATA	8,721	6,483	74.3%

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2010	100% of the IEPs for youth aged 16 and above will include all required secondary transition elements.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Timelines	Activities	Resources
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2010-2011	1. Use graduation, dropout, secondary transition and postsecondary outcomes data to develop and implement technical assistance and personnel development for district staff to enhance transition IEP compliance and quality.	Michigan Transition Outcomes Project (MI-TOP), Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services (OSE-EIS) Program Accountability (PA) Unit, Reaching and Teaching Struggling Learners (RTSL), National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC)
2010-2011	2. Provide sustained building-level personnel development using available district/building-level data to enhance transition IEP compliance and quality.	MI-TOP, OSE-EIS PA Unit, RTSL, NSTTAC
2010-2011	3. Provide policy and data guidance to support a long-term, outcomes-based approach to student-centered planning.	MI-TOP, OSE-EIS PA Unit, RTSL, NSTTAC

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

1. See SPP General Overview pages 1-8.
2. In March 2009 the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) designated Indicator 14 as a new indicator, revising the indicator language and measurement. This required states to establish a new baseline and targets in the FFY 2009 SPP.
3. The SPP was developed with input from state and local educational agencies, the state Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC)⁵¹, Michigan Rehabilitation Services (MRS), and Michigan Integrated Improvement Initiative projects.
4. The state established a new baseline, three measurable and rigorous targets, and improvement activities.
5. The previous SPP section for this indicator is included in Appendix N as a historical reference.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision/Postsecondary Outcomes
(Results Indicator)

Indicator 14: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement

- A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
- C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment

⁵¹ Michigan's IDEA mandated special education State Advisory Panel.

= [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

Michigan adopted the OSEP measurement table definitions for enrollment in higher education, competitive employment, enrollment in other postsecondary education or training, and some other employment (OMB NO: 1820-0624 / Expiration Date: 02/29/2012).

Enrolled in higher education is defined as enrollment on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four- or more year program) for at least one complete term at anytime in the year since leaving high school.

Competitive employment is defined as work for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training is defined as enrollment on a full- or part-time basis for at least one complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

Some other employment is defined as work for pay or in a self-employment setting for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services).

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Survey Instrument

The Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services (OSE-EIS) used the National Post-School Outcomes Center revised Stage 1: Post-School Data Collection Protocol approved by the OSEP in May 2010. See Appendix D for the *Postsecondary Outcomes Survey*.

Approved Research Protocol

The OSE-EIS collaborated with the Wayne State University (WSU) Center for Urban Studies to collect postsecondary outcomes data. The Human Investigation Committee of the WSU Institutional Review Board reviewed and approved the Michigan Postsecondary Outcomes Survey data collection procedures and protocols. The approved protocols address informed consent, confidentiality, and data security.

Survey Sample

The OSEP approved a three-year cohort sampling cycle for Michigan. Former students from every intermediate school district are included in each cohort. Each district is surveyed once in a three-year period, except for the one district with a student population greater than 50,000 where the survey is annual. The cohorts are representative in terms of demographics (disability type, gender, and race/ethnicity) based on the entire population of students with IEPs. For each cohort, students with IEPs grade 9 to age 22 who exited school (graduated, dropped out, or received a certificate of completion) in the previous academic year are surveyed. The Michigan Student Data System (MSDS) is the source for the necessary student information.

Survey Procedures

For FFY 2009, the survey was conducted in two stages. During the first stage, former students who exited high school during fall 2008 or spring 2009 (prior to the end of the school year) were surveyed in spring 2010. In the second stage, former students who exited high school at the end of the school year in 2009 were surveyed in the summer 2010.

Pre-survey notifications were mailed to former students and parents, guardians, or caregivers of former students under the age of 18. These notifications informed the recipients of the upcoming survey, explained the survey's purpose, how to obtain Spanish or Arabic versions of the survey, and how participants may opt out of the survey. Approximately two weeks after the pre-survey notification mailing, former students were sent a paper copy of the survey with a self-addressed postage-paid reply envelope. The survey packet included instructions on how to access and complete the survey online. Follow-up efforts included reminder postcards, re-mailed surveys, and Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI). Approximately one week after the survey mailing, interviewers began contacting non-respondents by telephone, offering them the option to complete the survey by telephone. If former students were unable to complete the survey, their parents, guardians, or caregivers were asked to provide survey responses.

Survey Tracking

Each survey was assigned a unique respondent code to allow matching with the former student's demographic information in the MSDS. This process allowed the inclusion of demographic characteristics of the former students.

Survey Analysis

Completed surveys were entered into a Statistical Package for the Social Sciences database for analysis. Each former student was placed into one of four mutually exclusive, hierarchical categories per the OSEP.

Table 1: Definitions of categories

1	Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school
2	Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education)
3	Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or training program, or competitively employed)
4	In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed)

Each former student was placed only in the first category where s/he met the category definition.

Once each former student was categorized using the above criteria, each was reported under the appropriate measure(s):

Table 2: Definitions of measures

A	Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	1
B	Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	1 + 2
C	Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school	1 + 2 + 3 + 4

Baseline Data for FFY 2009 (2009-2010):Response Rate

A total of 4,725 cohort 3 leavers were reported for the 2008-2009 school year. Of the 4,725 leavers, 4,065 were eligible to complete the survey; 660 leavers did not have accurate contact information, had returned to school, or were deceased. A total of 1,268 unduplicated responses were received for the FFY 2009 data collection for an overall response rate of 31.2 percent.

Table 3: Response rate table

Postal Mail	Telephone	Online	Total
548	714	6	1,268
43.2%	56.3%	0.5%	100%
[1,268 ÷ 4,065] = 31.2%			

During 2008-2009, 214 cohort 3 districts reported having eligible leavers. There were valid responses in 178 of these districts (83.2 percent). No valid responses were received relative to former students from 36 of these districts (16.8 percent).

Missing data

The overall response rate was 31.2 percent. Of 4,065 eligible students who left school during 2008-2009, the state is missing postsecondary outcome information for 68.8 percent (n=2,797) of former students from cohort 3 districts. In addition, the state is missing postsecondary outcome information for 651 of the 660 leavers who were not eligible because of incorrect or missing contact information. Analysis was conducted to identify patterns of missing data; however, no specific pattern was identified. To address the missing and invalid contact information, the state will continue to remind districts to inform students of the follow-up survey. Also, during 2009-2010 the MSDS incorporated an optional phone number field to help increase the ability of the WSU survey team to contact non-responders and offer CATI support in survey completion.

Representativeness of respondents

The *Differences in Proportions Test* (z-test) was used to identify representativeness of the respondent group on the characteristics of gender, race/ethnicity, exit status, and disability type in order to determine whether the respondents were statistically significantly different from the total cohort 3 population of students with IEPs who exited school in 2008-2009.

According to the *Differences in Proportions Test*, White youth were over-represented in the respondent group, while Black youth were under-represented. In terms of exit status, youth who graduated from high school with a diploma were over-represented in the respondent group while those youth who dropped out of high school were under-represented. Lastly, those youth with autism spectrum disorder and other health impairments were over-represented in the respondent group. See Table 4 below for a summary of the respondent groups' demographic information in comparison to overall cohort 3 population demographic information.

Table 4: Comparison of cohort 3 population and respondent sample

Demographic characteristics	Cohort 3 population		Respondent group	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Gender				
Female	1,718	36.4%	478	37.7%
Male	3,007	63.6%	790	62.3%
Race/Ethnicity				
American Indian	74	1.6%	16	1.3%
Asian	35	0.7%	9	0.7%
Black*	1,633	34.6%	365	28.8%
Hispanic	156	3.3%	33	2.6%
White*	2,827	59.8%	845	66.6%
Exit status				
Dropped out*	889	18.8%	109	8.6%
Graduated*	3,787	80.1%	1,139	89.8%
Received certificate	49	1.0%	20	1.6%
Disability category				
Autism Spectrum Disorder*	123	2.6%	59	4.7%
Cognitive Impairment	567	12.0%	128	10.1%
Deaf-Blindness	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Emotional Impairment	497	10.5%	107	8.4%
Hearing Impairment	69	1.5%	22	1.7%
Other Health Impairment*	414	8.8%	150	11.8%
Physical Impairment	125	2.6%	42	3.3%
Severe Multiple Impairment	11	0.2%	0	0.0%
Specific Learning Disability	2,811	59.5%	719	56.7%
Speech & Language Impairment	77	1.6%	25	2.0%
Traumatic Brain Injury	16	0.3%	7	0.6%
Visual Impairment	15	0.3%	9	0.7%

* Difference between cohort 3 population and respondent sample is statistically significant ($p < .05$).

To determine if the difference in the distribution between the respondent group and cohort 3 population significantly impacted the findings related to this indicator, weights were applied to adjust the sample sizes for each subgroup. Weights are commonly used to adjust survey results for under- and over-representation of specific subgroups in a sample population. Weighting provides an estimate of the

results that would be found if the distribution of a particular characteristic in the sample were identical to the distribution in the overall population.

Three weights were created and applied separately to the respondent group. After applying race/ethnicity and disability category weights to the respondent group, differences between the unweighted respondent group and weighted respondent group were not found to be statistically significant. This suggests that while the sample is not perfectly representative in terms of race/ethnicity and disability category, results are also not affected in a statistically significant manner.

However, after applying the exit status weight, differences between the unweighted respondent group and weighted respondent group were found to be statistically significant. This suggests that the sample is not representative in terms of students' exit status and, thus, Indicator 14 results are affected in a statistically significant manner. Therefore, the state weighted results by exit status and is reporting weighted baseline data for FFY 2009.

Baseline data

The weighted baseline results by data reporting category (Table 5) and weighted baseline measures for reporting (Table 6) for FFY 2009 are presented below. All data are weighted by exit status.

Table 5: Weighted baseline results by data reporting category

Category		Number	Percentage
1	Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	414	32.6%
2	Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	290	22.9%
3	Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school	98	7.7%
4	In some other employment within one year of leaving high school	60	4.7%
Categories 1 through 4 - TOTAL		862	68.0%
Leavers not captured by categories 1 through 4		406	32.0%
TOTAL		1,268	100.0%

Source: Modified National Post School Outcomes Center Survey

Table 6: Weighted baseline measures

Measure	Number	Percentage
A = Category 1	414	32.6%
B = Categories 1 + 2	704	55.6%
C = Categories 1 + 2 + 3 + 4	862	68.0%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

As seen in Table 6, Michigan's weighted baseline data for the three measures A, B and C are as follows:

- 32.6 percent of respondent leavers were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
- 55.6 percent of respondent leavers were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school; and
- 68.0 percent of respondent leavers were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets:Target Setting Methodology

The targets identified were developed by the OSE-EIS with input from a workgroup comprised of diverse community stakeholders and the SEAC.

The targets are 105 percent (baseline percent X 1.05 = target) of the FFY 2009 baseline data in each performance category. The resulting targets communicate that outcomes are important and will drive continued examination of factors that impact outcomes.

Rationale

Key factors considered for target setting for this final year of the current SPP:

- Students to be surveyed in 2011 have already exited from school, and there is no opportunity to impact their readiness to meet the indicator's outcomes.
- Other SPP indicators have established a practice of basing improvement on a percentage increase of the baseline/previous year data.
- The OSEP has an expectation that target setting be both realistic and rigorous.
- The MRS has documented a three-year declining trend in competitive employment rates amongst the individuals it serves.
- The Michigan Department of Human Services Medicaid Infrastructure Grant documented a decline in the employment rate for individuals with disabilities.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets
2010 (2010-2011)	<p>A. 34.3 percent of youth who are no longer in high school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>B. 58.4 percent of youth who are no longer in high school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>C. 71.4 percent of youth who are no longer in high school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school were enrolled in higher education or in some other education training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.</p>

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Timelines	Activities	Resources
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2010-2011	1. Use graduation, dropout, secondary transition and postsecondary outcomes data to develop and implement technical assistance and personnel development for district staff to improve postsecondary outcomes.	Michigan Transition Outcomes Project (MI-TOP), OSE-EIS Program Accountability (PA) Unit, Reaching and Teaching Struggling Learners (RTSL), National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC)
2010-2011	2. Provide sustained building-level personnel development using available district/building-level data to improve postsecondary outcomes.	MI-TOP, OSE-EIS PA Unit, RTSL, NSTTAC
2010-2011	3. Provide policy and data guidance to support a long-term, outcomes-based approach to student-centered planning.	MI-TOP, OSE-EIS PA Unit, RTSL, NSTTAC

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**Overview of Indicator 15 (Compliance Findings) Report Development:**

1. See General Overview pages 3-7.
2. For this indicator, all findings of noncompliance issued through the state's monitoring, state complaint, and due process hearing systems during FFY 2008 were reviewed.

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision/Compliance Findings

(Compliance Indicator)

Indicator 15: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

States are required to use the "Indicator 15 Worksheet" to report data for this indicator (see Attachment A).

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2004	100%		
2005		100%	100%
2006		100%	90.2%
2007		100%	94.8%
2008		100%	98.8%
2009		100%	93.0%*
Percent = [(# of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification) divided by (# of findings of noncompliance)] times 100.			
*[1,127 ÷ 1,212] X 100			

Sources: Michigan Hearings Database, Michigan State Complaint Database, monitoring data, and required data from other SPP indicators as referenced in the Indicator B-15 Worksheet.

INDICATOR B-15 WORKSHEET

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2008 (7/1/08 to 6/30/09)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 (7/1/08 to 6/30/09)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
1. Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular diploma.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other	0	0	0
2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.				
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other	0	0	0
7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrated improved outcomes.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	1	1	1
4A. Percent of districts identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other	20	20	15
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	11	11	11
5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 -educational placements.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other	4	4	3
6. Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 – early childhood placement.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	46	46	45

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2008 (7/1/08 to 6/30/09)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 (7/1/08 to 6/30/09)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	23	23	23
9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education that is the result of inappropriate identification.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other	23	23	22
10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other	446	526	460
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	7	7	7
12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other	109	109	104
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2008 (7/1/08 to 6/30/09)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 (7/1/08 to 6/30/09)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable student to meet the post-secondary goals.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other	274	315	312
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	1	1	1
Other areas of noncompliance: Consent Requirements	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	3	3	3
Other areas of noncompliance: Evaluation Process	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	4	4	4
Other areas of noncompliance: Free, Appropriate Public Education	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other	3	3	1
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	1	1	0
Other areas of noncompliance: Independent Educational Evaluation	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	6	6	6
Other areas of noncompliance: IEP Development	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other	83	83	83

APR – Part B

Michigan

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2008 (7/1/08 to 6/30/09)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 (7/1/08 to 6/30/09)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	10	10	10
Other areas of noncompliance: IEP Participation	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	5	5	5
Other areas of noncompliance: Notice Requirements	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	3	3	3
Other areas of noncompliance: Previous Enrollment in Special Education	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	7	7	7
Other areas of noncompliance: Teacher Certification	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or other	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	1	1	1
The worksheet automatically sums Column a and b			1,212	1,127
Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification =				93.0%

Sources: Michigan Hearings Database, Michigan State Complaint Database, monitoring data from the CIMS, and required data from other SPP indicators as referenced in the Indicator B-15 Worksheet.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed

Timelines	Activities	Status
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2006-2011	1. Review data from the State Complaint Database for timeliness, issues and trends within intermediate school districts (ISDs) and local educational agencies (LEAs) for supervision decisions regarding monitoring, compliance agreements or verification.	The State Complaints and Due Process Complaints staff of the Program Accountability Unit met regularly to discuss specific case issues, such as timelines, corrective action directives and districts trends. The data collection system was updated as additional data elements and capabilities were required. The complaint coordinator participated in the Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services (OSE-EIS) monthly conference calls with the ISD monitors from across the state and with the Program Accountability Advisory Team to ensure a consistent flow of information regarding procedural issues.
2006-2011	2. Conduct annual analysis of state performance through the APR and utilize results to determine priority areas for focused monitoring for the ensuing year.	The annual analysis was conducted and priority areas of disproportionate representation, suspension/expulsion and educational environments were selected and used to identify districts for focused monitoring activities.
2007-2011	3. Conduct an annual analysis of LEA data and utilize results to determine priority LEAs and make determinations for focused monitoring.	The analysis of these priority areas was conducted and used to select districts for focused monitoring activities.
2006-2011 annually	4. Continue full implementation of the CIMS at the LEA level.	The CIMS process has been fully implemented in accordance with the process outlined in Appendix A.
2007-2011	5. Disaggregate transition, disproportionate representation and child find data.	The OSE-EIS disaggregated and reviewed district level data related to early childhood and secondary transition, disproportionate representation and child find.
IMPROVE COLLABORATION/COORDINATION		
2008-2011	6. Develop and implement a more integrated set of General Supervision	A CIMS cross-indicator summit developed probe questions to help districts create improvement activities to address areas of

Timelines	Activities	Status
	activities across: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The general supervision SPP indicators • Michigan's Integrated Improvement Initiatives (MI3) • Michigan's emerging work with the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) General Supervision Framework 	noncompliance and low performance. This included all indicator leads, staff from MI3, and representatives from each OSE-EIS unit. This concluded the work for this activity.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2009:

Michigan's timely correction of noncompliance slipped from 98.8 percent to 93.0 percent. Prior to 2008, Michigan's monitoring system allowed districts up to two years to correct noncompliance and provide evidence of change. Following the 2007 OSEP verification visit and the issuance of the 09-02 memorandum in 2008, Michigan revised its system to require correction of noncompliance as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year. FFY 2008 was a pivotal year of understanding within districts and among OSE-EIS personnel about the obligation to correct and verify within a one year time frame. Michigan responded to this requirement with intensive training and technical assistance for the locals, including required participation in face-to-face regional and statewide meetings, web based trainings, conference calls, electronic messaging and increased enforcement actions for districts not meeting the one year time frame. Additionally, the CIMS was redesigned to emphasize and ensure timely correction and verification. This was launched in April 2009. Michigan anticipates progress in the next APR for this indicator as a result of these activities.

Correction of FFY 2008 Noncompliance:

Of the 1,212 findings issued during FFY 2008, 1,127 were corrected within one year. The table below provides the current status for each of the 85 findings that remained uncorrected after one year.

Michigan verifies correction of noncompliance by:

1. Reviewing subsequent data submissions,
2. Conducting on-site student record reviews,
3. Ensuring completion of approved corrective action plans (CAPs) that impact policies, procedures and practices,
4. Ensuring correction of student level noncompliance.

Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
1	4A	6	The district's practices related to the suspension and expulsion of students with IEPs were not compliant with the <i>Individuals with Disabilities Education Act</i> (IDEA) regulations.	<p>Finding Issued: August 7, 2008 as a result of a focused monitoring activity.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis. Increased state supervision and technical assistance were provided.</p> <p>Status: Corrected Date: November 4, 2010 Verified by: OSE-EIS technical assistance provider.</p>
2	4A	8	The district's practices related to the suspension and expulsion of students with IEPs were not compliant with the IDEA regulations.	<p>Finding Issued: April 15, 2009 as a result of a focused monitoring activity.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and provided technical assistance. As a result, the district revised its policies and procedures for suspension/expulsion, provided evidence of ensuring provision of procedural safeguards to parents, and provided professional development on these activities within a year of issuing the findings of noncompliance. However, student record reviews did not indicate full compliance.</p> <p>The OSE-EIS increased state supervision including subsequent student record reviews and site visits conducted in collaboration with the ISD on June 7, October 20 and December 6 of 2010 and January 5 of 2011. The OSE-EIS found continued noncompliance. The district superintendent is directed to provide compensatory education services to students not provided with a Free Appropriate Public</p>

Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
				<p>Education. Additional student record reviews and professional development are scheduled to ensure full compliance.</p> <p>Status: Uncorrected</p>
3	4A	29	<p>The district's practices related to the suspension and expulsion of students with IEPs were not compliant with the IDEA regulations.</p>	<p>Finding Issued: April 15, 2009 as a result of a focused monitoring activity.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and provided technical assistance. As a result, the district developed a process to conduct Manifestation Determination Reviews (MDR) if a pattern of removals exists or students are suspended for more than ten consecutive days, ensuring the provision of procedural safeguards to parents, and provided professional development on these activities within a year of issuing the findings of noncompliance. Student record reviews did not indicate 100% compliance.</p> <p>The OSE-EIS increased state supervision including subsequent student record reviews and site visits conducted in collaboration with the ISD on September 21, 27, October 6, 14, and December 13 of 2010 and January 6 of 2011 found continued noncompliance. The district has recently employed a full-time special education director. The district superintendent is directed to provide additional professional development and ensure adherence to MDR timelines and full compliance with all requirements. Additional student record reviews are scheduled to ensure full compliance.</p>

Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
				Status: Uncorrected
4	4A	44	The district's practices related to the suspension and expulsion of students with IEPs were not compliant with the IDEA regulations.	<p>Finding Issued: April 15, 2009 as a result of a focused monitoring activity.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis. Increased state supervision and technical assistance were provided.</p> <p>Status: Corrected Verified by: OSE-EIS technical assistance provider on November 24, 2010.</p>
5	4A	52	The district's practices related to the suspension and expulsion of students with IEPs were not compliant with the IDEA regulations.	<p>Finding Issued: December 17, 2008 as a result of a focused monitoring activity.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis. Increased state supervision and technical assistance were provided.</p> <p>Status: Corrected Verified by: OSE-EIS technical assistance provider on October 15, 2010.</p>
6	5	16	The district did not provide the services outlined in the IEP.	<p>Finding Issued: July 2, 2009 through the state complaint process.</p> <p>The OSE-EIS notified the district on July 2, 2009 to implement specific corrective actions by September 30, 2009.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: The family moved out of the district shortly after the directive for corrective action was issued. When the family notified the OSE-EIS of their new address and contact information, the OSE-EIS extended the corrective action timeline to July 31, 2010. When this deadline was not met, the OSE-EIS provided</p>

Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
				<p>intensified oversight regarding the provision of compensatory services. The status of this case is a standing agenda item for the monthly meeting that the Michigan Department of Education holds with the district.</p> <p>Status: Uncorrected</p>
7	5	16	The district did not provide students with IEPs access to the general education classroom or curriculum.	<p>Finding Issued: August 23, 2008 as a result of a focused monitoring activity.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root case analysis and submission of progress reports. Increased state supervision and technical assistance were provided.</p> <p>The OSE-EIS holds monthly meetings and conference calls, and makes on-site visits to bring the district into compliance. Participants in the meetings and conference calls include personnel from the district, ISD, MDE, OSE-EIS and the U.S. Department of Education regarding the district's high risk status and continued noncompliance.</p> <p>In addition, 20 percent of the district's IDEA funds are held by the ISD. Release of these funds is dependent on the completion of the activities specified in the CAP.</p> <p>Status: Uncorrected</p>
8	10	46	District's evaluation policies, procedures and practices were not compliant with IDEA.	<p>Finding Issued: January 12, 2009 as a result of a focused monitoring activity.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis. Increased state supervision and technical assistance were provided.</p>

Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
				Status: Corrected Verified by: OSE-EIS technical assistance provider on May 12, 2010.
9	11	57	The district did not complete all initial IEPs within the state timeline.	Finding Issued: September 16, 2008 based on an OSE-EIS data review. Summary of Activities: Based on a subsequent data review an additional finding was issued on April 15, 2009. The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. Status: Corrected Verified by: Data review on February 16, 2010.
10-11	11	19, 23	The district did not complete all initial IEPs within the state timeline.	Finding Issued: September 16, 2008 based on an OSE-EIS data review. Summary of Activities: Based on a subsequent data review an additional finding was issued on April 15, 2009. The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. Repeated data reviews were conducted until 100% compliant. Status: Corrected Verified by: Data review on March 9, 2010.
12-16	11	14, 21, 26, 31, 41	The district did not complete all initial IEPs within the state timeline.	Findings Issued: September 16, 2008 based on OSE-EIS data reviews. Summary of Activities: Based on a subsequent data review an additional finding was issued on April 15, 2009.

Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
				<p>The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports.</p> <p>Required participation in Child Find training, technical assistance, and repeated data reviews until 100 percent compliant.</p> <p>Status: Corrected Verified by: Data review on October 10, 2010.</p>
17	11	47	The district did not complete all initial IEPs within the state timeline.	<p>Finding Issued: September 16, 2008 based on OSE-EIS data reviews.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: Based on a subsequent data review an additional finding was issued on April 15, 2009.</p> <p>The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. Required participation in Child Find training, technical assistance, and repeated data reviews until 100 percent compliant.</p> <p>Status: Corrected Verified by: Data review on October 31, 2010.</p>
18-23	11	6, 37, 38, 39, 42, 56	The district did not complete all initial IEPs within the state timeline.	<p>Findings Issued: September 16, 2008 based on OSE-EIS data reviews.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: Based on a subsequent data review, additional findings were issued on April 15, 2009.</p> <p>The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. The OSE-EIS also required participation in Child Find training, technical</p>

Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
				<p>assistance, and repeated data reviews until 100 percent compliant. Given the continued noncompliance, districts were directed to convene a Review and Analysis Process Team to review prior year's instances of untimely initial IEP and submit data for the period of September 7 to November 15, 2010.</p> <p>Status: Corrected Verified by: Data review on January 18, 2011.</p>
24	11	16	The district did not complete all initial IEPs within the state timeline.	<p>Finding Issued: September 16, 2008 based on OSE-EIS data reviews.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: Based on a subsequent data review, an additional finding was issued on April 15, 2009.</p> <p>The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. The OSE-EIS also required participation in Child Find training, technical assistance, and repeated data reviews until 100 percent compliant. Given the continued noncompliance, districts were directed to convene a Review and Analysis Process Team to review prior year's instances of untimely initial IEPs and submit data for the period of September 7 to November 15, 2010. This was due on January 14, 2011 and data were not at 100 percent compliant.</p> <p>Increased state supervision continues, and new data will be required for the period of November 15, 2010 to January 31, 2011.</p> <p>Status: Uncorrected</p>
25-28	11	30, 32, 34, 62	The district did not complete all	Findings Issued: April 15, 2009 based on an OSE-EIS data review.

Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
			initial IEPs within the state timeline.	<p>Summary of Activities: The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. The OSE-EIS required participation in Child Find training, technical assistance, and repeated data reviews until 100 percent compliant.</p> <p>Status: Corrected Verified by: Data review on May 14, 2010.</p>
29-30	11	12, 28	The district did not complete all initial IEPs within the state timeline.	<p>Findings Issued: April 15, 2009 based on an OSE-EIS data review.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. The OSE-EIS required participation in Child Find training, technical assistance, and repeated data reviews until 100 percent compliant.</p> <p>Status: Corrected Verified by: Data review on June 9, 2010.</p>
31-51	11	3, 4, 5, 9, 14, 15, 21, 24, 26, 27, 31, 36, 40, 41, 48, 50, 51, 54, 59, 61, 66	The district did not complete all initial IEPs within the state timeline.	<p>Findings Issued: April 15, 2009 based on an OSE-EIS data review.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. The OSE-EIS required participation in Child Find training, technical assistance, and repeated data reviews until 100 percent compliant.</p> <p>Status: Corrected Verified by: Data review on October 20, 2010.</p>
52-58	11	1, 18, 20, 25, 45, 47, 49	The district did not complete all initial IEPs within the state	<p>Findings Issued: April 15, 2009 based on an OSE-EIS data review.</p> <p>Summary of Activities:</p>

Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
			timeline.	<p>The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. The OSE-EIS required participation in Child Find training, technical assistance, and repeated data reviews until 100 percent compliant.</p> <p>Status: Corrected Verified by: Data review on October 31, 2010.</p>
59	11	13	The district did not complete all initial IEPs within the state timeline.	<p>Finding Issued: April 15, 2009 based on an OSE-EIS data review.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. The OSE-EIS required participation in Child Find training, technical assistance, and repeated data reviews until 100 percent compliant.</p> <p>Status: Corrected Verified by: Data review on November 12, 2010.</p>
60	11	63	The district did not complete all initial IEPs within the state timeline.	<p>Finding Issued: April 15, 2009 based on an OSE-EIS data review.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. The OSE-EIS required participation in Child Find training, technical assistance, and repeated data reviews until 100 percent compliant.</p> <p>Status: Corrected Verified by: Data review on November 17, 2010.</p>
61-69	11	6, 33, 37, 39, 42, 53, 58, 64, 65	The district did not complete all initial IEPs within the state timeline.	<p>Findings Issued: April 15, 2009 based on an OSE-EIS data review.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and</p>

Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
				<p>submission of progress reports. The OSE-EIS required participation in Child Find training, technical assistance, and repeated data reviews until 100 percent compliant. Given the continued noncompliance, districts were directed to convene a Review and Analysis Process Team to review prior year's instances of untimely initial IEPs and submit data for the period of September 7 to November 15, 2010.</p> <p>Status: Corrected Verified by: Data review on January 18, 2011.</p>
70-74	11	7, 16, 38, 55, 56	The district did not complete all initial IEPs within the state timeline.	<p>Findings Issued: April 15, 2009 based on an OSE-EIS data review.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. The OSE-EIS required participation in Child Find training, technical assistance, and repeated data reviews until 100 percent compliant. Given the continued noncompliance, districts were directed to convene a Review and Analysis Process Team to review prior year's instances of untimely initial IEPs and submit data for the period of September 7 to November 15, 2010. This was due on January 14, 2011 and data were not at 100 percent. Increased state supervision and technical assistance continues and new data are required for the period of November 15, 2010 to January 31, 2011.</p> <p>Status: Uncorrected</p>
75	12	22	The district did not hold IEPs prior to the third birthday for those children	<p>Finding Issued: September 16, 2008 based on an OSE-EIS data review.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: Based on a subsequent data review,</p>

Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
			transitioning from Part C to Part B programs and services.	<p>an additional finding was issued on April 15, 2009. The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. Increased state supervision and technical assistance were provided. The MDE repeated data reviews until 100 percent compliant.</p> <p>Status: Corrected Verified by: Data review on December 9, 2009.</p>
76	12	17	The district did not hold IEPs prior to the third birthday for those children transitioning from Part C to Part B programs and services.	<p>Finding Issued: September 16, 2008 based on an OSE-EIS data review.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: Based on a subsequent data review, an additional finding was issued on April 15, 2009. The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. Increased state supervision and technical assistance were provided. The MDE repeated data reviews until 100 percent compliant.</p> <p>Status: Corrected Verified by: Data review on December 16, 2009.</p>
77-79	12	39, 43, 55	The district did not hold IEPs prior to the third birthday for those children transitioning from Part C to Part B programs and services.	<p>Findings Issued: September 16, 2008 based on an OSE-EIS data review.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: Based on a subsequent data review, an additional finding was issued on April 15, 2009. The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. Increased state supervision and technical assistance were provided. The MDE repeated data reviews until 100 percent compliant.</p>

Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
				Status: Corrected Verified by: Data review on September 15, 2010.
80	13	60	The Transition Plans reviewed from the district did not meet IDEA requirements.	Finding Issued: September 16, 2008 based on an ISD transition coordinator's IEP review. Summary of Activities: Based on a subsequent data review, an additional finding was issued on April 15, 2009. The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. Technical assistance and oversight was provided by the ISD transition coordinator and the Michigan Transition Outcomes Project personnel. Status: Corrected Verified by: Data review on December 2, 2009.
81-82	13	16, 35	The Transition Plans reviewed from the district did not meet IDEA requirements.	Finding Issued: September 16, 2008 based on an ISD transition coordinator's IEP review. Summary of Activities: Based on a subsequent data review, an additional finding was issued on April 15, 2009. The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. Technical assistance and oversight was provided by the ISD transition coordinator and the Michigan Transition Outcomes Project personnel. Status: Corrected Verified by: Data review on December 16, 2009.
83	Other: FAPE	2	District was not providing programs or services to	Finding issued: November 18, 2008 as a result of a focused monitoring activity.

Finding	Indicator	District Identifier	Nature of Noncompliance	Program-Specific Follow-Up Activities Related To The Uncorrected Noncompliance
			students with IEPs.	<p>Summary of Activities: The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. Increased state supervision and technical assistance were provided. Frequent progress reports and reviews of student level data were required.</p> <p>Status: Corrected Verified by: OSE-EIS technical assistance provider on April 15, 2010.</p>
84	Other: FAPE	11	District was not providing Special Education programs or services to students with IEPs.	<p>Finding issued: November 12, 2008 as a result of a focused monitoring activity.</p> <p>Summary of Activities: The OSE-EIS required a CAP based on a root cause analysis and submission of progress reports. Increased state supervision and technical assistance were provided. Frequent progress reports and reviews of student level data were required.</p> <p>Status: Corrected Verified by: OSE-EIS technical assistance provider on May 10, 2010.</p>
85	Other: FAPE	49	Programs and services outlined in the IEP did not constitute FAPE.	Order of Correction issued: February 2, 2009 following the adjudication of a Due Process Hearing. The Administrative Law Judge's decision was appealed to the federal district court. The student's placement is on Stay Put and the order cannot be implemented until the court renders its decision.

Timely Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):

1. Number of findings of noncompliance the state made during FFY 2008 (the period from July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009)	1,212
2. Number of FFY 2008 findings the state verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of notification to the LEA of the finding)	1,127
3. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year [(1) minus (2)]	85

FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance Not Timely Corrected (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance and/or Not Corrected):

4. Number of FFY 2008 findings not timely corrected (same as the number from (3) above)	85
5. Number of FFY 2008 findings the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction")	74
6. Number of FFY 2008 findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected [(4) minus (5)]	11

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2009

Timelines	New and Revised Activities	Justification
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2010-2011	<i>New Activity:</i> Conduct interviews to identify risk factors and effective strategies that may impact timely correction of noncompliance.	By identifying risk factors and effective strategies that impact timely correction of noncompliance by districts, the state will improve technical assistance support and achieve 100 percent compliance with this indicator.
	Resources CIMS Workbook, OSE-EIS, Public Sector Consultants	

Timelines	New and Revised Activities	Justification
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2010-2011	<p><i>New Activity:</i> Enhance the electronic function of the CIMS to include focused monitoring activities, technical assistance activities, enforcement activities and the tracking of the correction of noncompliance.</p> <p>Resources CIMS Electronic Workbook, Public Sector Consultants</p>	The electronic system that tracks findings and monitoring activities within the local districts will be enhanced to include the focused monitoring activities, technical assistance activities, enforcement activities and the tracking of the correction of noncompliance.
2008-2011	<p><i>Deletion of Activity 6:</i> Develop and implement a more integrated set of General Supervision activities across:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The general supervision SPP indicators • MI3 • Michigan's emerging work with the NCSEAM General Supervision Framework 	The activity has been completed.

Michigan Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 98.8 percent. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 94.8 percent. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100 percent.</p> <p>The State reported</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR, the State's data demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance, identified in FFY 2008, in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §300.149 and 300.600(e); and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of noncompliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2008: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100 percent compliance) based on a review of updated</p>	<p>In reporting on correction of noncompliance, Michigan assures the OSEP that it has corrected 93.0 percent of the instances of noncompliance within the one year timeframe. An additional 74 districts corrected prior to the February 1, 2011 APR submission, resulting in 99.1 percent of the findings being corrected at the time of the APR submission. Michigan has verified that each district program with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, and that each district has</p>

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>that 322 of 326 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner, three findings subsequently were corrected by October 28, 2009 and one finding subsequently was corrected by July 1, 2009.</p>	<p>data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 worksheet. In addition, in responding to Indicators 4A, 9, 10, 11, and 12 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p>	<p>corrected each individual case of noncompliance unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Page 150 describes the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 4A, 9, 10, 11, and 12 in the FFY 2009 APR due February 1, 2011, Michigan has reported on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators and has used the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p>

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**Overview of Indicator 16 (State Complaints) Report Development:**

1. See General Overview pages 3-7.
2. On April 3, 2009 the Michigan Department of Education (MDE), Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services (OSE-EIS) began to implement a new single-tier complaint system, replacing the two-tier system that had been in effect for over 30 years. FFY 2009 was the first year that all state complaints were completed using the single-tier system.
3. In FFY 2009 the percentage of state complaints that were withdrawn by complainants more than doubled. The OSE-EIS attributes this to portions of the single-tier complaint procedures that encourage alternative dispute resolution; including:
 - setting aside time at the beginning of the process and encouraging the parties to meet and attempt to resolve the matter;
 - interaction with districts that acknowledge noncompliance;
 - enhanced collaboration between the OSE-EIS and the intermediate school district (ISD) investigators and the three-way and four-way communication with complainants and districts.
4. During FFY 2009, revisions to the state complaint procedures were identified as being necessary to enhance the implementation of the new single-tier system. Public comment was obtained in February and March of 2010, and the procedures were finalized and became effective in June of 2010.
5. Additional database changes were made in FFY 2009 to track and report Part B complaints filed under the single-tier system.
6. In addition, the OSE-EIS took preliminary steps to develop a new database that will better track state complaints and integrate data from state complaints, due process complaints and mediation.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision/State Complaints

(Compliance Indicator)

Indicator 16: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within the 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = $[(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) \text{ divided by } 1.1] \text{ times } 100.$

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2004	100%		
2005		100%	99.0%
2006		100%	99.2%
2007		100%	100%
2008		100%	96.7%
2009		100%	99.2%*
Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.			
*[(117 + 15) ÷ 133] X 100			

Source: Michigan Due Process Database and Michigan Hearings Database

Analysis of Complaint Data for FFY 2008 – FFY 2009

	FFY 2008	FFY 2009
(1) Written, signed complaints total	240	204
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued	212	133
(a) Reports with findings	125	79
(b) Reports within timelines	153	117
(c) Reports with extended timelines	52	15
(1.2) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed	26	70
(1.3) Complaints pending	2	1
(a) Complaints pending a due process hearing	0	0

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed

Timelines	Activities	Status
PROVIDE TRAINING/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT		
2009-2011	1. Continued training of all stakeholders regarding implementation of single-tier complaint system	The OSE-EIS provided training at the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education ⁵² Summer Institute and Michigan Council for Exceptional Children annual conference.

⁵² Michigan's state affiliate of the National Council for Administrators of Special Education and the Council for Exceptional Children.

Timelines	Activities	Status
IMPROVE DATA COLLECTION		
2009-2011	2. Expand database to integrate information across due process, monitoring, mediation and state complaint data sets.	Expansion activities continued throughout FFY 2009. The OSE-EIS collaborated with the Michigan Department of Technology, Management and Budget to initiate development of a new database including contracting with a private company to complete the “needs assessment and requirements” phase of the process.
2009-2011	3. Improve database to track single-tier complaints	Multiple updates and improvements to the existing database were made throughout the year as needs were identified.
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2008-2011	4. Develop and implement a plan for ongoing maintenance and continuous improvement of the system.	The OSE-EIS Program Accountability (PA) Unit conducted the annual review and revision of the State Complaint Procedures and Administrative Rules to improve implementation of the single-tier state complaint system. Beginning in spring 2010 a plan was established to review procedures and rules twice per year.
2008-2011	5. Develop and implement a more integrated set of General Supervision activities across: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The general supervision SPP indicators • The Michigan’s State Personnel Development Grant, Michigan’s Integrated Improvement Initiative (MI3) • Michigan’s emerging work with the NCSEAM⁵³ General Supervision Framework 	The OSE-EIS PA Unit met monthly to develop policies and procedures relevant to the general supervision indicators. FFY 2009 activities included development of guidance documents for the field regarding discipline, private school placement, revision of evaluation and reevaluation procedures, the new state IEP and service plans. The OSE-EIS collaborated with MI3’s Center for Educational Networking in development and dissemination of these documents and supporting documents relative to the single-tier complaint system.
2009-2011	6. Make changes to administrative rules and procedures necessary to	Revisions to the state complaints procedures were identified and presented to stakeholders for public

⁵³ National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring.

Timelines	Activities	Status
	implement the single-tier complaint system.	comment and hearings in March and April of 2010. The revisions became effective in June of 2010.
2009-2011	7. Evaluate the effectiveness/impact of the single tier complaint system, and use evaluation results for continuous improvement of the system.	Review of the data indicates areas of improvement attributable to portions of the single-tier process including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the number of complaints resolved without investigation district acknowledgement of noncompliance prior to investigation percent of complaints completed within the timeline or an extended timeline for exceptional circumstances.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2009:

Michigan did not meet its FFY 2009 target. During FFY 2009, the OSE-EIS completed 132 of 133 complaints (99.2 percent) within 60 days or an extended timeline for exceptional circumstances. This is an improvement of 2.5 percent from FFY 2008.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2009

None required at this time.

Michigan Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>The State revised the indicator language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 96.7 percent. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 100 percent. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100 percent.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152. If the State does not report 100 percent compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>	<p>Michigan reviewed the improvement activities and determined that implementation of the current activities will ensure that the state is in compliance.</p>

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**Overview of Indicator 17 (Hearings Adjudicated) Report Development:**

1. See General Overview pages 3-7.
2. Pursuant to an Interdepartmental Agreement (IA) with the State Office of Administrative Hearings and Rules (SOAHR)⁵⁴ hearings are conducted by administrative law judges (ALJs) who are hired and supervised by the SOAHR. The MDE and the SOAHR met regularly to review and revise procedures to ensure compliance with timeline requirements.
3. The MDE and the SOAHR collaborated for ALJ training in FFY 2009.
4. Other enhancements to the due process complaint system included changes and additions to the database, the ALJ Summary Report form, and revisions to state administrative rules and procedures which were promulgated and became effective June 11, 2010.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision/Hearings Adjudicated

(Compliance Indicator)

Indicator 17: Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2004	100%		
2005		100%	100%
2006		100%	83.3%
2007		100%	75.0%
2008		100%	83.3%
2009		100%	100%*
Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100. ⁵⁵			
*[(3 + 2) ÷ 5] X 100			

Source: Michigan Hearings Database

⁵⁴ Pursuant to a Governor's Executive Order in 2005, all due process hearings in Michigan must be conducted by the SOAHR.

⁵⁵ See the *Analysis of Due Process Hearing Data for FFY 2008 – FFY 2009* table on next page.

Analysis of Due Process Hearing Data for FFY 2008 – FFY 2009

	FFY 2008	FFY 2009
(3) Hearing requests total ⁵⁶	72	65
(3.1) Resolution sessions (Percent of total hearing requests)	58 (80.6%)	54 (83.1%)
(3.2) Hearings (fully adjudicated) (Percent of total hearing requests)	6 (8.3%)	5 (7.7%)
(a) Decisions within timeline (Percent of fully adjudicated hearings)	2 (33.3%)	3 (60.0%)
(b) Decisions within extended timeline (Percent of fully adjudicated hearings)	3 (50.0%)	2 (40.0%)
(3.2)(a) + (3.2)(b) (Percent of fully adjudicated hearings that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.)	5 (83.3%)	5 (100%)
(3.3) Resolved without a hearing (Percent of closed complaints)	56 (90.3%)	43* (89.6%)
(4) Expedited hearing requests total (Percent of total hearing requests)	25 (34.7%)	18 (27.7%)
Hearings pending	10	17

Source: Michigan Hearings Database

- *65 (hearing requests) minus 17 (hearing requests pending) = 48 concluded hearing requests;
- 48 (concluded hearing requests) minus 5 (fully adjudicated hearings) = 43 hearing requests resolved without a hearing;
- 43 of the 48 concluded hearing requests were resolved without a hearing = 89.6 percent

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed

Timelines	Activities	Status
PROVIDE TRAINING/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT		
2007-2011	1. Provide ongoing selection, training and evaluation of ALJs to assure continuing compliance with timeline requirements through efforts of SOAHR staff through the collaboration between the MDE and the SOAHR.	The MDE continued to collaborate with the SOAHR for ALJ training. In addition, the MDE and the SOAHR met regularly to discuss revisions to procedures to ensure compliance with timeline requirements.

⁵⁶ Parents now file a "due process complaint" per IDEA 2004 language, which is synonymous with Hearing Requests as referenced in this SPP Indicator.

Timelines	Activities	Status
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2006-2011	2. Develop common expectations for diligent and prompt attention to completion of due process hearing activities among hearing officers, hearing participants and stakeholders.	New Due Process Complaint Procedures and Administrative Rules were promulgated with input from stakeholders. Public hearings and comments relative to these procedures and rules were conducted in February and March 2010 and became effective in June 2010.
2007-2011	3. Revise the role and responsibilities of the MDE Due Process Complaint Coordinator as needed.	No revisions were needed for FFY 2009.
2007-2011	4. Review the IA between the SOAHR and the OSE-EIS; revise the role and responsibilities of the parties as needed.	The MDE and the SOAHR met multiple times to discuss changes to procedures. It was determined that revisions to the IA were not necessary.
2006-2010	5. Revise due process complaint procedures as needed to reflect new single tier due process complaint system and 2004 <i>Individuals with Disabilities Education Act</i> (IDEA) Regulations.	New Due Process Complaint Procedures and Administrative Rules were promulgated with input from stakeholders. Public hearings and comments relative to these procedures and rules were conducted in February and March 2010 and became effective in June 2010.
2008-2011	6. Develop and implement a more integrated set of General Supervision activities across: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The general supervision State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators The Michigan's State Personnel Development Grant, Michigan's Integrated Improvement Initiative (MI3) Michigan's emerging work with the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring General Supervision Framework 	<p>The OSE-EIS Program Accountability (PA) Unit met monthly to develop policies and procedures relevant to the general supervision indicators. The OSE-EIS PA Unit met routinely to develop a new framework for investigation/response to systemic complaints that includes collaboration with state complaints, due process hearings and monitoring staff.</p> <p>The OSE-EIS PA Unit met with the Program Accountability Advisory Team (PAAT) throughout FFY 2009. The PAAT provided valuable input regarding proposed revisions to rules and procedures. The OSE-EIS collaborated with MI3, the Center for Educational Networking and Michigan Special</p>

Timelines	Activities	Status
		Education Mediation Program to develop additional documents, forms and training/information dissemination strategies for stakeholders.
CLARIFY/EXAMINE/DEVELOP POLICIES AND PROCEDURES		
2006-2011	7. Provide increased opportunities for stakeholders' participation in policy, rules and procedures revisions.	This activity occurred through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Special Education Advisory Committee⁵⁷ • Public Comment/Hearings • Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education⁵⁸ meetings • Intermediate school district director meetings • Compliance monitor meetings • Michigan Association of Public School Academies Annual Conference • Michigan Council for Exceptional Children Annual Conference • PAAT meetings
2006-2010	8. Revise Michigan Administrative Rules for Special Education as needed, to reflect new single tier due process complaint system and 2004 IDEA Regulations.	New Due Process Complaint Procedures and Administrative Rules were promulgated with input from stakeholders. Public hearings and comments relative to these procedures and rules were conducted in February and March 2010 and became effective in June 2010.
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2006-2011	9. Disseminate a due process complaint procedures document to reflect new single tier due process complaint system and 2004 IDEA Regulations.	Promulgation of new rules and procedures was completed and approved on June 11, 2010. These documents were disseminated in November, 2010.
2007-2011	10. Create and disseminate a Michigan special education due process frequently asked questions document.	Plans are underway to implement this activity when other activities related to promulgating administrative rules and creating procedures are completed.
2009-2010	11. Create a due process complaint procedures document	A due process complaint procedure document was created in FFY 2009.

⁵⁷ Michigan's IDEA mandated special education State Advisory Panel.

⁵⁸ Michigan's state affiliate of the National Council of Administrators of Special Education and the Council for Exceptional Children.

Timelines	Activities	Status
	to reflect new single tier due process complaint system and 2004 IDEA Regulations.	Stakeholder input was provided during public hearing and comment period in February and March 2010. Promulgation of administrative rule was completed June 11, 2010. The due process complaint procedures document was disseminated in fall 2010.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2009:

Michigan met the 100 percent target for this indicator. The state's performance improved from five of six (83.3 percent) hearings fully adjudicated within the required timelines during FFY 2008 to five of five (100 percent) of hearings fully adjudicated within the required timelines during FFY 2009. The OSE-EIS attributes this improvement to increased collaboration between the OSE-EIS and the SOAHR.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2009

None required at this time.

Michigan Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>The State revised the indicator language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 83.3%. These data are based on six due process hearings. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p>	<p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2009 APR, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the due process hearing timeline requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>	<p>Michigan reviewed the improvement activities and determined that implementation of the current activities, combined with routine review and revision of the IA between the MDE and SOAHR, will ensure that the state is in compliance.</p>

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**Overview of Indicator 18 (Resolution Session Agreements) Report Development:**

1. See General Overview pages 3-7.
2. Pursuant to an Interdepartmental Agreement (IA) with the State Office of Administrative Hearings and Rules (SOAHR)⁵⁹ hearings are conducted by administrative law judges (ALJs) who are hired and supervised by the SOAHR. During FFY 2009, there were ALJ changes at the SOAHR requiring new staff training regarding reporting of known resolution sessions and settlement agreements.
3. Tracking of resolution sessions and settlement agreements improved through the ALJs' use of case summary reports. Also, in June 2010, procedures were approved through the public hearing process requiring districts to submit a resolution session summary form to report completion and outcome of resolution sessions.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision/Resolution Session Agreements (Results Indicator)

Indicator 18: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B))

Measurement: Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2005	36.4%		
2006		36.0%	45.3%
2007		37.0%	64.3%
2008		38.0%	46.6%
2009		40.0%	46.3%*
Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100. ⁶⁰			
*(25 ÷ 54) x 100			

Source: Michigan Hearings Database

⁵⁹ Pursuant to a Governor's Executive Order in 2005, all due process hearings in Michigan must be conducted by the SOAHR.

⁶⁰ See the Analysis of Hearing Request Data for FFY 2008 – FFY 2009 table on the next page.

Analysis of Hearing Request Data for FFY 2008 – FFY 2009

	FFY 2008	FFY 2009
(3) Total Hearing requests ⁶¹	72	65
(3.1) Resolution sessions (Percent of total hearing requests)	58 (80.6%)	54 (83.1%)
(3.1(a)) Number of resolution session settlement agreements (Percent of resolution sessions)	27 (46.6%)	25 (46.3%)

Source: Michigan Hearings Database

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed

Timelines	Activities	Status
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2007-2011	1. Review Interdepartmental Agreement (IA) between the SOAHR and the Michigan Department of Education (MDE); revise the roles and responsibilities of the parties as needed.	The MDE and the SOAHR met multiple times to discuss changes to procedures. It was determined that revisions to the IA were not necessary.
2008-2011	2. Develop and implement a more integrated set of activities across: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The general supervision State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators • The Michigan's State Personnel Development Grant, Michigan's Integrated Improvement Initiative • Michigan's emerging work with the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring General Supervision Framework 	The Michigan Special Education Mediation Program (MSEMP) continued to provide mediation and alternative dispute resolution services. During FFY 2009, the MSEMP continued to expand services for resolution session facilitation.
2009-2011	3. Develop policies and procedures to implement new administrative rules as they relate to alternative dispute resolution and resolution sessions.	New due process complaint/hearing rules and procedures were promulgated during FFY 2009, which became effective June 11, 2010. These rules and procedures include requirements for districts to submit reports relative to resolution sessions.

⁶¹ Parents now file a "due process complaint" per IDEA 2004 language, which is synonymous with Hearing Requests as referenced in this indicator.

Timelines	Activities	Status
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2009-2011	4. Provide technical assistance regarding new administrative rules and regulations as they relate to "Resolution Sessions" and "Resolution Session Settlement Agreements."	Training and technical assistance was provided at the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education ⁶² Summer Institute and the Michigan Council for Exceptional Children annual conference.
2009-2011	5. Continue to monitor and evaluate the implementation of resolution session activities to date. Revise in accordance with performance data.	Informal discussions were conducted with multiple stakeholders regarding improving the percentage of resolution sessions conducted and settlement agreements developed. Participants included: Program Accountability Advisory Team members, parents and their advocates/attorneys, the Michigan Protection and Advocacy Service, Inc. and district administrators and their attorneys.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2009:

Michigan met its FFY 2009 target of 40 percent, with the percentage of resolution session settlement agreements remaining relatively steady from 46.6 percent in FFY 2008 to 46.3 percent in FFY 2009. In addition, the percentage of due process complaints settled without full adjudication remained relatively constant from FFY 2005 – 2009; between 89 percent and 93 percent.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2009

Timelines	New and Revised Activities	Justification
PROVIDE TRAINING/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT		
2010-2011	<i>New Activity:</i> Improve monitoring of district compliance with requirements for resolution sessions; including reporting mechanism.	The <i>Individuals with Disabilities Education Act</i> requires offering and reporting on resolution sessions.
	Resources OSE-EIS staff, ISD planner/monitors, the SOAHR, ISD directors and administrators	

⁶² Michigan's state affiliate of the National Council for Administrators of Special Education and the Council for Exceptional Children.

Michigan Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 46.6%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 64.3%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 38%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>	<p>None required per FFY 2008 Response Table.</p>

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**Overview of Indicator 19 (Mediation Agreements) Report Development:**

1. See General Overview pages 3-7.
2. For this indicator, the Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services (OSE-EIS) used data from the Michigan Mediation Database. The activities continue to focus on the elements necessary to increase the use of mediation throughout the state in order to help parents and educators avoid or resolve conflict relative to special education programs/services.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision / Mediation Agreements
(Results Indicator)

Indicator 19: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2004	72.7%		
2005		74.0%	87.7%
2006		75.0%	80.4%
2007		76.0%	80.4%
2008		77.0%	78.8%
2009		78.5%	84.5%*
Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.			
*[(1 + 70) ÷ 84] X 100			

Source: Michigan Mediation Database

Analysis of Mediation Data for FFY 2008 – FFY 2009

	FFY 2008	FFY 2009
(2.1) Mediations held	113	84
(2.1)(a)(i) Mediations related to due process complaints that resulted in complete agreement (Percent of mediations held)	3 (2.7%)	1 (1.2%)
(2.1)(b)(i) Mediations not related to due process complaints that resulted in complete agreement (Percent of mediations held)	86 (76.1%)	70 (83.3%)
(2.1)(a)(i) + (2.1)(b)(i) (Percent of mediations held)	89 (78.8%)	71 (84.5%)

Source: Michigan Mediation Database

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed

Timelines	Activities	Status
PROVIDE TRAINING/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT		
2006-2011	1. Build capacity of parents and educators to maximize the use of mediation through skill-building workshops.	<p>The Michigan Special Education Mediation Program (MSEMP):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conducted presentations throughout Michigan to introduce parents and educators to the program. • Conducted a series of workshops for parents statewide in conjunction with the Michigan Alliance for Families⁶³ and the Michigan Family-to-Family Health Information and Education Center. • Conducted a series of conflict resolution workshops in each of six self-selected intermediate school districts to improve outcomes in Individualized Education Program (IEP) team meetings. • Planned and conducted a statewide conflict resolution workshop for planner monitors in collaboration with Oakland Schools. • Entered preliminary discussions with the Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education⁶⁴ to assist in developing and delivering a conflict resolution workshop for professional educators in FFY 2010.

⁶³ Michigan's Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) beginning 10/1/2009.⁶⁴ Michigan's state affiliate of the National Council for Administrators of Special Education and the Council for Exceptional Children.

Timelines	Activities	Status
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initiated planning for two videos to demonstrate mediation and IEP facilitation for use on the MSEMP Web site and distribution by digital video disc.
IMPROVE DATA COLLECTION		
2006-2011	2. Use the new compliance database to increase opportunities for use of mediation and track progress in mediation.	The MSEMP participated in discussions with the OSE-EIS and Analytics International to define data specifications and protocols for a new integrated database to track mediations, due process complaints and state complaints.
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2006-2011	3. Explore feasibility of providing targeted technical assistance in high complaint districts.	The MSEMP and the OSE-EIS explored developing a common set of definitions for issues that arise in mediations and complaints. The definitions will be used to identify and report high incidence issues which in turn will guide targeted technical assistance.
2006-2011	4. Increase coordination with the OSE-EIS complaint and hearing staff.	<p>The MSEMP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assisted the OSE-EIS in developing procedures for referring state complaints to the MSEMP for mediation with advance permission of the complainant. Contributed to the development of prototype "one-pagers" providing user-friendly introductions to important provisions of the <i>Individuals with Disabilities Education Act</i>. Shared program information with planner/monitors in monthly OSE-EIS phone conferences. Served as a resource at conferences for program information important to the OSE-EIS and its constituents.
IMPROVE COLLABORATION/COORDINATION		
2007-2011	5. Develop and implement a more integrated set of general supervision activities across: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The general supervision SPP indicators Michigan's 	<p>As a participant in MI3, the MSEMP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participated in MI3 Professional Development and Coaching training. Participated in state IEP training. Explored the potential impact of mediation center work in restorative justice on Indicators 2 (Dropout), 4A (Suspension/Expulsion) and 11 (Child Find). Participated in MI3 design meetings as a

Timelines	Activities	Status
	Integrated Improvement Initiatives (MI3) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Michigan's emerging work with the NCSEAM⁶⁵ General Supervision Framework 	member of the leadership team. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contributed to MI3 community learning forums on evaluative thinking and grant management. Coordinated trainings with Michigan Alliance for Families and attended their strategic design meetings.
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT		
2006-2011	6. Research and introduce new collaborative problem-solving techniques for use in mediation.	The MSEMP: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviewed recent research on conflict resolution skills development and teamwork in special education. Drafted <i>Focus on Results</i> article based on the research to encourage IEP teams to make greater use of collaborative skills in addressing disagreements. Conducted research in dialogue, parent-teacher communication and collaborative techniques for breaking deadlocks.
2006-2011	7. Improve mediator trainings held to emphasize techniques for reaching agreements.	The MSEMP: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developed a mediator survey to explore challenges and training needs to inform mediator training. Conducted advanced mediator training that focused on issues related to discipline, transition, child find, Response to Intervention, writing sound agreements, and breaking the impasse in mediation and IEP facilitation. Initiated, with the Center for Educational Networking (CEN), the design of a page within the MSEMP Web site to provide mediator access to OSE-EIS, OSEP and MSEMP procedure, guidance and training materials relating to dispute resolution. Identified information needed, but not currently provided by the OSE-EIS mediation database, to help the MSEMP design advanced trainings targeted to specific issues found to be challenging for mediators.

⁶⁵ National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring.

Timelines	Activities	Status
2006-2011	8. Increase the use of IEP facilitation.	Since 2004, the number of facilitated IEP meetings conducted by the MSEMP generally has increased. In FFY 2009, 60 facilitated IEP meetings were conducted, a decrease from the previous year. The parties in 88.3 percent of the meetings agreed with the terms of the IEP and agreed to implement the IEP. This represents an increase from 86.1 percent in FFY 2008.
CLARIFY/EXAMINE/DEVELOP POLICIES AND PROCEDURES		
2007-2011	9. Implement statewide proposed OSE-EIS dispute resolution policy (when approved) encouraging early collaborative dispute resolution before and after the filing of a state complaint.	<p>The MSEMP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revised its general information brochure to compare informal dispute resolution methods with formal complaints. • Incorporated information about the new procedures into their presentations and workshops. • Participated in the OSE-EIS training on the new procedures (See Activity #4 above).
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2007-2011	10. Publish a newsletter to highlight MSEMP services and proposed policies at the Michigan Department of Education.	The MSEMP published four editions of its newsletter which were distributed to educators and parent groups by the CEN through its special education mailing list. The newsletters were also available for download on the MSEMP Web site. Newsletter topics included the OSE-EIS dispute resolution policy, the benefits of mediation and IEP facilitation, and MSEMP performance data.
2008-2011	11. Provide technical assistance on continuum of dispute resolution alternatives.	<p>The OSE-EIS provided general program information and referral services through a staffed phone line.</p> <p>The MSEMP intake staff was trained to describe dispute resolution options and program services to callers.</p> <p>The OSE-EIS and MSEMP distributed brochures that described the program and provided contact information.</p> <p>The MSEMP Web site described the program and enabled visitors to request services.</p>

Timelines	Activities	Status
		Trained staff provided guidance to the MSEMP service centers on policy and procedure questions, investigated and remedied concerns about quality of service from school personnel and parents, and collaborated with Wayne State University for program evaluation.

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2009:

Michigan exceeded its target for the year, achieving an agreement rate of 84.5 percent compared to a target of 78.5 percent. Michigan experienced a 5.7 percent increase in its mediation agreement rate from the 78.8 percent in FFY 2008. The increase can be partly attributed to an advanced mediator training that was provided to correct the slippage reported in FFY 2008.

Mediation requests for the year totaled 145. The number of mediations conducted was 84, a decline from 113 in the previous year. The decline can be attributed to a three percent increase in the number of requests withdrawn or not otherwise mediated as well as an increase in filed complaints resolved through direct school-parent discussions.

The agreement rate for IEP facilitation rose from 86.1 percent in FFY 2008 to 88.3 percent in FFY 2009. The number of facilitations held declined from 72 to 60. In all, the MSEMP mediated or facilitated 165 cases during the year and achieved an agreement in 139 for an overall agreement rate of 84.2 percent.

In summary, Michigan met its target for the fourth consecutive year.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2009

None required at this time.

Michigan Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 78.8%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 80.4%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 77%.	OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2009 APR.	None required per FFY 2008 Response Table.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2009 (2009-2010)**Overview of Indicator 20 (Timely and Accurate Data) Report Development:**

1. See General Overview pages 3-7.
2. The Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services' (OSE-EIS) Performance Reporting Unit and grantees from Wayne State University (WSU), Public Sector Consultants (PSC), and Interagency Information Systems (IIS) reviewed data submitted in the FFY 2009 APR and § 618 data submitted on February 1, 2010, November 1, 2010 and February 1, 2011, to determine the extent to which all reported data were timely, complete and passed edit checks. They also:
 - Provided explanations of year-to-year changes requested by Westat, Inc. on behalf of the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP).
 - Reviewed all formulas and instructions provided by the OSEP to assure that they were followed.
3. In order to comply with new and/or changes to data reporting requirements as soon as possible, OSE-EIS representatives routinely participated in the OSEP and North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC) technical assistance calls, the Westat, Inc./OSEP Data Managers' meeting and listserv, the OSEP Leadership Conferences and the Educational Information Management Advisory Consortium.

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision/Timely and Accurate Data

(Compliance Indicator)

Indicator 20: State reported data (Section 618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

State reported data, including 618 data, State Performance Plan, and Annual Performance Reports, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity; placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel and dispute resolution; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports and assessment); and
- b. Accurate, including covering the correct year and following the correct measurement.

Measurable and Rigorous Targets			
a. Reports and data are submitted on or before due dates			
FFY	Baseline	Target	Actual
2005 (2005-2006)	100%		
2006 (2006-2007) through 2008 (2008-2009)		100%	100%
b. Reports and data are accurate			
2005 (2005-2006)	90.0%		
2006 (2006-2007) through 2008 (2008-2009)		100%	100%

Sources: Single Record Student Database and the Michigan Compliance Information System (MI-CIS)

Actual FFY 2009 Data:

Part B Indicator 20 Data Rubric

SPP/APR Data - Indicator 20			
APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Correct Calculation	Total
1	1		1
2	1		1
3A	1	1	2
3B	1	1	2
3C	1	1	2
4A	1	1	2
4B	1	1	2
5	1	1	2
7	1	1	2
8	1	1	2
9	1	1	2
10	1	1	2
11	1	1	2
12	1	1	2
13	1	1	2
14	1	1	2
15	1	1	2
16	1	1	2
17	1	1	2
18	1	1	2
19	1	1	2
		Subtotal	40
APR Score Calculation	Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2009 APR was submitted on time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.		5
	Grand Total - (Sum of subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =		45

618 Data - Indicator 20					
Diagram	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Responded to Data Note Requests	Total
Table 1 - Child Count Due Date: 2/1/10	1	0	0	1	2
Table 2 - Personnel Due Date: 11/1/10	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 3 - Ed. Environments Due Date: 2/1/10	1	1	0	1	3
Table 4 - Exiting Due Date: 11/1/10	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 5 - Discipline Due Date: 11/1/10	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 6 - State Assessment Due Date: 2/1/11	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	1
Table 7 - Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/1/10	1	1	1	N/A	3
				Subtotal	18
618 Score Calculation			Grand Total (Subtotal X 2.143) =		38.57
Indicator #20 Calculation					
A. APR Grand Total					45.00
B. 618 Grand Total					38.57
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =					83.57
Total N/A in APR					0
Total N/A in 618					0
Base					90.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Base*) =					.9286
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =					92.86

* Note any cell marked as N/A will decrease the denominator by 1 for APR and 2.143 for 618

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed

Timelines	Activities	Status
IMPROVE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING		
2005-2011	1. Enforce submission deadlines.	The OSE-EIS enforced submission deadlines through district Determinations and by informing all districts in memos and at conferences and organization meetings that districts not meeting submission deadlines would be subject to sanctions.
2005-2011	2. Continue to distribute widely, teach about, and use the District Data Portraits.	District Data Portraits continued to be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A primary mechanism for assessing and improving data quality. The OSE-EIS and IIS continued to use District Data Portraits as a teaching tool with districts by demonstrating how to review and identify data inaccuracies. • Distributed at conferences and organization meetings so that districts could examine their data in order to address potential problems. • Used by state and intermediate school district monitors as a data source for focused monitoring activities. • Used by the Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System (CIMS) local review and analysis process teams for developing improvement activities.
CLARIFY/EXAMINE/DEVELOP POLICIES AND PROCEDURES		
2005-2011	3. Continue implementation of internal process that ensures timely reporting.	In order to produce the § 618 data tables, data needed for each of the SPP indicators, and meet federal reporting deadlines, the OSE-EIS and IIS updated and used business rule documents for each of these procedures. Each document delineates the tasks to be performed, who will perform them and when they will be completed.
PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE		
2005-2011	4. Continue working with data personnel	The work consisted of a variety of methods to assess and verify data

	from Detroit Public Schools and other districts as necessary to improve the accuracy and timeliness of reporting.	accuracy and timeliness issues with Detroit Public Schools and other districts that have had difficulties providing accurate and timely data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performed quality checks of submitted data to identify common errors in reporting accurate and complete data. • Provided technical assistance to target these common errors and provide guidance on how to correctly report problematic data elements; i.e., data fields. • Monitored districts that have had problems with reporting accurate data through the CIMS.
--	---	---

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2009:

Michigan met the 100 percent target for Timely Data; however, Michigan did not meet the Accurate Data target. This performance represents slippage from FFY 2008. A review of data reported to EDFacts revealed some data discrepancies. Specifically, in the Child Count data,

- Michigan reported using the five race framework using proportional redistribution of the children of two or more races. Because of the redistribution, it appeared that the data were incomplete.
- Michigan identifies students as developmentally delayed through age seven. There were zero's included for children age eight and older. The Data Accountability Center (DAC) advised Michigan that for ages eight and older, there should have been nothing entered for developmentally delayed rather than a zero.

In the Educational Environment data,

- initially subtotals were omitted. Those were completed following notification from the DAC.
- there were some counts omitted in the EDFacts submission that should have been zeros. (the inverse of what occurred in Child Count).
- Because of the proportional redistribution of the children of two or more races noted above, there was a slight mismatch in computed/reported totals.

All students in all settings from all districts/agencies were accounted for, and Michigan responded to all DAC requests for clarification.

Discipline and exit data initially reported contained cells with no data, which were interpreted by the EDFacts and Data Transmission Sheets (Tables 4 and 5) as negative nines (-9s). This required the OSE-EIS to resubmit some data files with zeroes (0s) in the affected cells. These inconsistencies were resolved prior to the

data being finalized, and therefore did not impact the ability of the OSE-EIS to report accurate data. In addition, differences between assessment data reported in Table 6 and that reported through the EDFacts continue to impede Michigan's ability to become "EDFacts-Only" with respect to assessment data. Many of the inconsistencies can be attributed to different data reporting requirements mandated by the OSEP and those approved in Michigan's Accountability Workbook. The OSE-EIS has continued to work closely with EDFacts personnel to identify these differences in order to become "EDFacts-Only."

The data advisory committee continued to meet to advise the OSE-EIS on coordinated and strategic special education:

- Data collection - Evaluate programming and technical manual language to optimize the ease and accuracy of special education data submissions and reduce data burden on all parties.
- Data verification - Collaborate to evaluate data verification efforts.
- Data reporting – Report data to the U.S. Department of Education, districts, the public and state of Michigan colleagues.
- Data analysis and use - Evaluate the quality and impact of services for Michigan's students with Individualized Education Programs.

The advisory committee is comprised of district and state agency personnel who have knowledge and experience in performing and improving data collections, verifications and reporting. The committee provides a forum for the OSE-EIS to collaborate with field personnel on data initiatives such as data verification efforts. Such collaboration has resulted in more accurate and complete data reported by districts.

An OSE-EIS workgroup, comprised of staff from the Center for Education Performance and Information, the OSE-EIS, IIS and PSC, met several times to redesign the rubric for evaluating districts on the extent to which they report accurate data. The new rubric became part of the methodology used when making 2009-2010 school year Determinations, and will be updated for the purpose of making 2010-2011 school year Determinations.

The OSE-EIS continued to conduct additional verification efforts for discipline, child find and early childhood transition data reported by districts. Specifically, for Indicators 4A (Suspension/Expulsion) and 4B (Suspension/Expulsion by Race/Ethnicity), districts that reported disciplinary actions constituting less than one percent (<1.0%) of their total number of students with disabilities were asked to verify their data. Districts that had discipline data they failed to report were asked to submit the missing data. All verification districts were asked to sign an assurance statement, indicating their data were accurate and complete by the end of the verification process.

For Indicator 11 (Child Find) districts that reported data constituting less than one percent (<1.0%) of their total number of students with disabilities were asked to verify their data in a process parallel to discipline. In addition, districts that reported initial IEPs constituting 25 percent or more of their total number of

students with disabilities were also asked to verify their data. Districts that reported incorrect data had an opportunity to request deletion of incorrect data. All districts were required to sign an assurance statement, whether deletions were made or not.

Finally, the OSE-EIS collaborated with the Office of Early Childhood Education and Family Services (ECE&FS) to verify Indicator 12 (Early Childhood Transition) data reported by ISDs. All ISD CIMS coordinators were asked to review their data and revise/resubmit as necessary.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2009

None required at this time.

Michigan Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table from OSEP

Indicator Status	OSEP Analysis and Next Steps	Michigan Response
The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 100%.	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in <i>Individuals with Disabilities Education Act</i> sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>	In reporting on Indicator 20, Michigan has used the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.

Acronyms Used in the APR

AA-AAS	Alternate Assessments based on Alternate Achievement Standards
AA-MAS	Alternate Assessments based on Modified Achievement Standards
ALJ	Administrative Law Judge
APR	Annual Performance Report
ARR	Alternate Risk Ratio
AYP	Adequate Yearly Progress
CADRE	Consortium for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education
CAP	Corrective Action Plan
CAST	Center for Applied Special Technology
CATI	Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing
CEN	Center for Educational Networking
CEPI	Center for Educational Performance and Information
CIMS	Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System
CIMS-2	Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System redesign
COP	Community of Practice
CSPR	Consolidated State Performance Report
DAC	Data Accountability Center
ECE&FS	Early Childhood Education & Family Services
ECO	Early Childhood Outcomes
ECSE	Early Childhood Special Education
EIMAC	Education Information Management Advisory Consortium
ELA	English Language Arts
ELPA	English Language Proficiency Assessment
EOT&TA	<i>Early On</i> [®] Training and Technical Assistance Grant
ESA	Educational Service Agencies
ESEA	<i>Elementary and Secondary Education Act</i>
FAPE	Free Appropriate Public Education
FFY	Federal Fiscal Year
GAD	Graduation and Dropout
GSEG	General Supervision Enhancement Grant
IA	Interdepartmental Agreement
ICLE	International Center for Leadership in Education
IDEA	<i>Individuals with Disabilities Education Act</i>
IEP	Individualized Education Program
IES	Institute of Education Sciences
IIS	Interagency Information Systems
ISD	Intermediate School District
LEA	Local Educational Agency
LRE	Least Restrictive Environment
MAPs	Mandated Activities Projects
MARSE	Michigan Administrative Rules for Special Education
MDE	Michigan Department of Education
MDR	Manifestation Determination Review
MEAP	Michigan Educational Assessment Program
MI3	Michigan's Integrated Improvement Initiatives
MI-BLSi	Michigan's Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative (a SPDG)
MI-CIS	Michigan Compliance Information System
MI-TOP	Michigan Transition Outcomes Project

MME	Michigan Merit Examination
MRS	Michigan Rehabilitation Services
MSDS	Michigan Student Data System
MSEMP	Michigan Special Education Mediation Program
NAAC	National Alternate Assessment Center
NASDSE	National Association of State Directors of Special Education
NCRRC	North Central Regional Resource Center
NCSEAM	National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring
NDPC	National Dropout Prevention Center
NDPC-SD	National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities
NECTAC	National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center
NGA	National Governors Association
NHSC	National High School Center
NICHCY	National Dissemination Center for Children with Disabilities
NIMAS	National Instructional Materials Accessibility Standard
NIRN	National Implementation Research Network
NPSO	National Post School Outcomes Center
NSTTAC	National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center
OEAA	Office of Educational Assessment and Accountability
OEII	Office of Education Improvement and Innovation
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
OSE-EIS	Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services
OSEP	Office of Special Education Programs
OSI	Office of School Improvement
PA	Program Accountability
PAAT	Program Accountability Advisory Team
Part B	Part B of IDEA
Part C	Part C of IDEA
PBIS	Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports
PBS	Positive Behavior Support
PSA	Public School Academy (aka Charter School)
PSC	Public Sector Consultants
PTI	Parent Training and Information Center
RAP	Review Analysis Process
REL	Regional Educational Laboratory
RR	Risk Ratio
RTSL	Reaching and Teaching Struggling Learners
RtI	Response to Intervention
SEAC	Special Education Advisory Committee, Part B State Advisory Panel
SIG	State Improvement Grant
SISEP	State Implementation and Scaling-up of Evidence-based Practices Center
SLI	Speech and Language Impairments
SOAHR	State Office of Administrative Hearings and Rules
SPDG	State Personnel Development Grant
SPP	State Performance Plan
SRSD	Single Record Student Database
START	STatewide Autism Resources and Training
USED	United States Department of Education
WRR	Weighted Risk Ratio
WSU	Wayne State University

FFY 2009 Annual Performance Report

Appendix A:

Overview of the

Continuous Improvement and

Monitoring System

As Developed and Implemented in Michigan

Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System OVERVIEW

The Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System (CIMS) is the monitoring system used by the Michigan Department of Education (MDE), Offices of Special Education and Early Intervention Services (OSE-EIS) and Early Childhood Education and Family Services (ECE&FS). The state uses this system to ensure compliance with the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA) of 2004 and the *Michigan Administrative Rules for Special Education* and promote positive student outcomes.

The CIMS was designed to help the state and its locals (a comprehensive term used in CIMS to describe local educational agencies, public school academies⁶⁶, service areas, and state agencies) analyze and interpret data as well as record all monitoring activities in a single location. The CIMS reflects the priorities of the IDEA 2004 and the State Performance Plan (SPP), and aligns with the Michigan School Improvement Framework.

In assessing the performance of its locals, the OSE-EIS monitors data collected through:

- Focused monitoring activities (on site, desk audit, or self review)
- Complaints
- Data reviews
- Due process hearings
- Local performance plans
- Other activities

Michigan evaluates the performance of each local relative to the SPP indicator targets. If areas of noncompliance with the IDEA or state regulations are identified, the state must issue a finding of noncompliance to the local. The finding is a written notification which explains the area of noncompliance and includes the citation of the statute, rule, or regulation related to the noncompliance and a description of the data supporting the state's conclusion. All identified noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year, and verified by the state within that year.

During Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2009, the CIMS electronic workbooks were launched on September 15, 2009, December 15, 2009 and April 15, 2010.

Elements of the CIMS Process

The CIMS processes and tools include the following:

⁶⁶ Charter schools in Michigan are referred to as Public School Academies.

Electronic Workbooks

Electronic workbooks help locals organize information and activities related to the monitoring process. Each local is issued a CIMS workbook three times a year. Each workbook contains a series of reports – some for informational purposes and some that require action on the part of the local.

A Series of Reports Containing Local Data

Reports and other tools in the electronic workbook are designed to assist locals to work through the entire continuous improvement process. The workbook guides users by providing a list of tasks that must be completed depending on the local's performance on the SPP indicators and other state priorities. The workbook helps locals organize, implement, and track the status of reports and activities, and provides the necessary reports, forms, and resources to successfully complete this process. The electronic workbook contains the following reports:

A Local Strand Report – divides the SPP indicators into compliance and results indicators and provides an annual measure of a local's performance relative to each of the SPP indicator targets.

A Determinations Report – provides an annual rating of a local's performance in meeting the requirements of the IDEA.

A Monitoring Activities Report (MAR) - gives information on OSE-EIS monitoring activities which affect the local including notification of upcoming on-site reviews, desk audits or self-reviews. Each workbook provides each local with information regarding the local's performance or other issues identified by OSE-EIS monitoring activities. A MAR may require action. The local reviews the report each monitoring cycle and makes sure required actions are performed and completed by the due date (e.g., if the local does not meet the state graduation target, the MAR instructs the local to identify the root cause of the poor performance, complete and submit a results transmittal to the School Improvement Team for consideration by the specified date).

A Special Education Focused Monitoring Report – is a written notification issued to a local from the OSE-EIS citing any areas of noncompliance found during any monitoring activity including focused monitoring or data reviews.

Review and Analysis Process (RAP) Teams

Each local must form a RAP team to review and analyze CIMS reports. Each team provides oversight, guidance, and structure in the corrective action or improvement planning process. The RAP team is responsible for (1) reviewing and analyzing local reports and data and (2) completing the assigned tasks. The work is organized into three categories: compliance and correction; results and improvement; and student and child data.

Compliance and correction: If a local is issued a Report of Findings, it must address the noncompliance by: (1) identifying the root cause of the areas of noncompliance

and development/submission of corrective action plans (CAPs), (2) implementing the CAPs, and (3) completing the verification of correction process.

The electronic workbook contains probe questions and CAP forms to guide this process. The OSE-EIS requires that research-based practices are used and a list of scientifically-based guidance resources is posted to the CIMS Web site at www.cenmi.org/cims. The OSE-EIS reviews and approves all submitted CAPs. If necessary, the district is required to clarify or modify the CAP prior to OSE-EIS approval. Assigned technical assistance providers assist with the CAP process for all focused monitoring findings.

RAP teams track the implementation and effectiveness of correction and improvement activities. Progress reports are submitted to the OSE-EIS per an established schedule (see chart below). Once all activities are completed, the local requests closeout of the CAP.

There are two prongs of verification of correction by the OSE-EIS:

- Prong 1 – The local has corrected each individual case of noncompliance; and
- Prong 2 – The local is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100 percent compliance), based on the state's review of updated data.

Verification activities may include:

- A review of updated policies, procedures or practices
- A review of the results of student/child record reviews, or evidence that training or technical assistance was obtained
- A review of new data submitted through the state data systems.

Based on this review, the OSE-EIS establishes that the local is correctly implementing the specific statutory or regulatory requirements and that the identified noncompliance has been corrected. Once evidence of correction can be verified, the OSE-EIS notifies the local, closes the CAP, and issues a closeout report.

If correction of noncompliance is not completed before the workbook due date, the OSE-EIS mandates technical assistance, training, or other enforcement action to promptly bring the local into compliance. A finding remains active until closeout is verified by the OSE-EIS.

Corrective Action Plan Dates			
Workbook Starts	CAP Due	Progress Report	Closeout
April 15	June 15	October 1	December 1
September 15	November 15	March 15	April 15
December 15	February 15	June 15	September 15

Results and improvement: Each April, locals are issued a Strand Report that compares the local's performance on SPP indicators to state targets. The local convenes a RAP team and conducts the activities described above.

Student and child data: In addition to addressing SPP indicators, locals may be asked to verify data. Specific directions on how to complete student and child data activities are provided to locals through the CIMS workbook and by webinar as needed.

A Systemic Approach Leads to Improvement

The CIMS provides locals the tools to see the same data and information the state sees when making monitoring decisions. In addition to helping the state and locals keep track of the tasks and activities required by the IDEA, CIMS helps locals put special education monitoring into context, defines a predictable schedule of events, and establishes a system of improvement.

Information is stored in a single electronic location; this includes corrective action plans, progress reports, student-level data and evidence of correction on findings of noncompliance. Locals are provided processes and tools to guide the improvement and correction activities within a prescribed calendar which will lead to compliance and improved outcomes for children and students with disabilities.

FFY 2009 Annual Performance Report

Appendix B:

Michigan's Integrated Improvement Initiatives

MI3–Michigan’s Integrated Improvement Initiatives
A systems approach to program improvement
June 2010

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE), Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services (OSE-EIS) has been developing a system to better advance evidence-based practices in the field of education to support diverse learners. The OSE-EIS has historically funded numerous statewide initiatives, Mandated Activities Projects (MAPs),⁶⁷ under Part B of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA) for students with disabilities ages 3 through 21. These state initiatives have typically addressed needs identified through new federal and/or state mandates, systemic compliance findings or stakeholder-based concerns.

Changes to federal education legislation have heightened the focus on both student performance and system accountability. These changes, reflected in the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (ESEA) and IDEA, have also brought a clear focus on evidence-based practices to enhance and improve instructional delivery. Aligned with these changes is a focus on fiscal expenditures and cost to value assessments. As a result it becomes more important that activities funded under the IDEA result in improved system efficiencies and effectiveness. The need to coordinate, integrate and evaluate these activities requires a new approach and systematic assessment of cost efficiencies and program effectiveness. Thus the need for Michigan’s Integrated Improvement Initiatives (MI3) was conceptualized.

The OSE-EIS is required under the IDEA to have a system of general supervision in place to ensure compliance and effective implementation of statutory requirements. The eight components of a system of general supervision are:

1. State Performance Plan
2. Policies, Procedures and Practices
3. Data on Processes and Results
4. Targeted Technical Assistance and Personnel Development
5. Effective Dispute Resolution
6. Integrated Monitoring Activities
7. Improvement, Correction, Incentives and Sanctions
8. Fiscal Management

A systems approach to program improvement aligns well within the structure of general supervision and enhances the ability of the OSE-EIS to respond affirmatively to the statutory and regulatory requirements of the IDEA.

The design of MI3 is predicated upon effective strategies, supported by research and evidence-based practice, effective implementation of those strategies, development of capacity to sustain improved results over time and the efficient use of resources to reach across the entire state. Directors and key staff of identified state initiatives meet regularly to provide input on strategies of how to work together to better serve students with unique and diverse learning needs. These

⁶⁷ Michigan’s state improvement and compliance initiatives, funded with IDEA administrative set-aside funds.

strategies include, but are not limited to, increased coordination and integration across all projects in the areas of marketing and communication, project/process management, evaluation, fiscal management and effective implementation of evidence-based practices.

A linchpin component of the MI3 design is the research on implementation. Part of the discovery work is a collective understanding of the purpose of each state initiative, the evidence-based practices or mandates each project supports, how data are collected and used, how projects manage resources and what strategies projects use for marketing and communication. A key element in any change process is how well and how consistently a practice is implemented. Drs. Dean Fixsen and Karen Blasé, co-directors of the National Implementation Research Network (NIRN), have completed a comprehensive meta-analysis of the research on implementation practices. This research forms the basis of the design of MI3's mission, to coordinate and integrate the use of evidence-based practices and support effective implementation of these practices across Michigan.

Members of the MI3 Initiative include the following initiatives:

1. Center for Educational Networking (CEN)
2. Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System (CIMS)
3. Michigan Alliance for Families⁶⁸
4. Michigan Department of Education-Low Incidence Outreach (MDE-LIO)
5. Michigan Special Education Mediation Program (MSEMP)
6. Michigan Transition Outcomes Project (MI-TOP)
7. Michigan's Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative (MiBLSi, a State Personnel Development Grant)
8. Michigan's Integrated Mathematics Initiative (MIMI)
9. Michigan's Integrated Technology Supports (MITS)
10. Project Find Michigan
11. Reaching and Teaching Struggling Learners (RTSL)
12. STatewide Autism Resources and Training (START)

For more information please contact:

Beth A. Steenwyk, Director

Michigan's Integrated Improvement Initiatives (MI3)

(231) 288-4001

beth.a.steenwyk@mac.com

⁶⁸ Michigan's Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) beginning 10/1/2009.

FFY 2008 Annual Performance Report

Appendix C

**Business Rules for Calculation of Local Education Agency
(LEA) Disproportionate Representation in Special
Education and Related Services
for All Disabilities and for Specific Categories
of Disabilities by Race/Ethnicity**

March 2010 Revision

**Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services
Michigan Department of Education (MDE)**

**Procedures for Calculation of LEA Disproportionate Representation
in Special Education & Related Services
for All Disabilities and for Specific Categories of Disabilities
by Race/Ethnicity**

March 2010 Revision

1. Disproportionate representation calculations use data from the fall 2008 Single Record Student Database (SRSD)⁶⁹, fall 2009 Michigan Student Data System (MSDS)⁷⁰ and the December 1, 2008 & December 1, 2009 Michigan Compliance Information System (MI-CIS).⁷¹ Only students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs), ages 6 through 21, per the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA) Part B definition, are counted.⁷² The racial/ethnic subgroups of students are drawn from the data in SRSD/MSDS, and the disability category is based on the information in MI-CIS.
2. Calculations are only performed for districts with 30 or more students with IEPs.
3. Calculations are only performed for a given racial/ethnic subgroup (American Indian, Asian, Black, Hispanic, or White) within a district if the total enrollment in the operating district (including special education) for all other racial/ethnic subgroups (total enrollment comparison group) is more than 100.
4. Calculations are only performed for racial/ethnic subgroups with 10 or more students in a given disability category (autism spectrum disorder, cognitive impairment, emotional impairment, other health impairment, specific learning disability and speech and language impairment).
5. A Weighted Risk Ratio (WRR) is used to determine disproportionate representation for a particular racial/ethnic subgroup when the district's student population is similar to the state racial/ethnic distribution and there are at least 10 students with IEPs in all other racial/ethnic subgroups (disability comparison group).
 - For Indicator 9, the comparison group is all students with IEPs of any other racial/ethnic subgroup.
 - For Indicator 10, the comparison group is all students in the specific disability category among the other racial/ethnic subgroups.

⁶⁹ Single Record Student Database (SRSD) is the statewide data system for all schools/students.

⁷⁰ Michigan Student Data System (MSDS) is the new statewide data system for all schools/students.

⁷¹ The Michigan Compliance Information System (MI-CIS) is the statewide special education data system.

⁷² Students who are home-schooled, who attend private schools, or who have been placed in facilities for adjudicated youth are excluded.

See the following URL page 16 to 18 for additional resource information:

<https://www.ideadata.org/docs/Disproportionality%20Technical%20Assistance%20Guide.pdf>

6. A Risk Ratio (RR) is used instead of the WRR to determine disproportionate representation when the racial/ethnic distribution of the district's student population varies significantly from the state racial/ethnic distribution. The RR compares identification rates by race/ethnicity against the district's total student population. Specifically:
 - For Indicator 9, if the number of white or black students with IEPs in a given district is equal to zero, the MDE will forego use of the WRR in favor of the RR in that district. This also applies to Indicator 10, where the number of white or black students with a specific disability in a given district is equal to zero.
 - For Indicator 9, when the number of white or black students with IEPs in a given district is fewer than three, if the WRR value is greater than or equal to 2.5 and the RR value is less than or equal to 1.5 (so that the difference between the two measures is greater than or equal to one), MDE will forego use of the WRR in favor of the RR in that district. This also applies to Indicator 10, where the number of white or black students with a specific disability in a given district is fewer than three.

See the following URL page 8 to 12 for additional resource information:

<https://www.ideadata.org/docs/Disproportionality%20Technical%20Assistance%20Guide.pdf>

7. An Alternate Risk Ratio (ARR) is used to determine disproportionate representation for a particular racial/ethnic subgroup when there are fewer than 10 students with IEPs in all other racial/ethnic subgroups (disability comparison group). Note: It is not appropriate to forego use of the ARR in favor of the RR unless there are zero Black or White students in a given district.
 - For Indicator 9, the comparison group is all students with IEPs of any other racial/ethnic subgroup.
 - For Indicator 10, the comparison group is all students in the specific disability category among the other racial/ethnic subgroups.

See the following URL page 21 to 22 for additional resource information:

<https://www.ideadata.org/docs/Disproportionality%20Technical%20Assistance%20Guide.pdf>

8. Two sets of the three ratios (WRR, ARR and/or RR) are calculated, using the operating district and resident district data, for each racial/ethnic group across all disabilities and for each racial/ethnic group within each of the six designated disability categories.
 - If there is an operating district ratio but no resident district ratio (due to a small number of resident students), the operating district ratio is used to determine disproportionate representation.
 - If there is no operating district ratio, but there is a resident district ratio, the district is not considered for disproportionate representation.
 - Public School Academies (PSAs)⁷³ have only one set of ratios as they are only operating districts.
 - Students participating in ISD center programs are reflected in resident district counts.
9. The lower of the district's operating district ratio or resident district ratio is used to determine over-representation. Districts are considered to have over-representation when the appropriate ratio (WRR, ARR or RR) is greater than 2.5 for two consecutive years for any racial/ethnic group across all disabilities or for any racial/ethnic group within a single disability category.
10. The higher of the district's operating district ratio or resident district ratio is used to determine under-representation. Districts are considered to have under-representation when the appropriate ratio (WRR, ARR or RR) is less than 0.4 for two consecutive years for any racial/ethnic group across disabilities or for any racial/ethnic group within a disability category.
11. Districts identified as having disproportionate representation per the above business rules will have an opportunity to verify their data. Upon completion of the verification process, the results will be reviewed in conjunction with data from multiple sources to determine appropriate focused monitoring activities.

⁷³ Charter schools in Michigan are referred to as Public School Academies.

Proportional Allocation of Multiracial/Ethnic Students

Designating Race/Ethnicity for Students

In the SRSD⁷⁴ and MSDS⁷⁵, a district reports the race/ethnicity for each student. There are six (6) categories of race/ethnicity reported: American Indian, Asian, Black, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, White and Hispanic. This gives six (6) possible racial/ethnic groups to be reported. A number 1 aligned with a racial/ethnic group indicates that the family has designated it as a primary race.

When a student indicates a single race/ethnicity, the designation for race/ethnicity is clear. The student is then counted in that group. For federal special education reporting purposes, students who are classified in Michigan as Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander are placed in the category Asian.

Designating Race/Ethnicity for Students Indicating Multiple Priorities

In the case of multiple number 1s, the student is indicating more than one primary racial/ethnic group. When this occurs, the student is categorized as multiracial/ethnic.

Michigan will implement the new multiracial/ethnic federal reporting requirements in 2010-2011. In the meanwhile, the multiracial/ethnic students must be classified into one racial/ethnic group. OSEP⁷⁶ recommends distributing multiracial/ethnic students proportionately into the other race/ethnicity categories.

Proportional Allocation of Multiracial/Ethnic Students

The following is a step-by-step process for this proportional allocation:

1.	Total the number of students reported as a single primary race. e.g., 2705 White + 88 Black + 25 Asian + 11 American Indian + 68 Hispanic = <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"><div>Total single primary race = 2897</div><div>Reported Multiracial = 29</div></div>
2.	For each race/ethnic category, calculate the single race proportion by dividing the single primary race total by the single race count. e.g., White % = $2705 / 2897 = 0.9337$
3.	Multiply the multiracial total by the calculated proportions of each of the racial/ethnic categories. e.g., To determine the white proportion of the multiracial: $29 * 0.9337 = 27.078$
4.	Distribute multiracial/ethnic students proportionately by adding the proportional share of multiracial/ethnic students to the each single race/ethnic group.

⁷⁴ Single Record Student Database (SRSD) is the statewide data system for all schools/students.

⁷⁵ Michigan Student Data System (MSDS) is the new statewide data system for all schools/students.

⁷⁶ United States Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP).

FFY 2009 Annual Performance Report

Appendix D:

Postsecondary Outcomes Survey



Postsecondary Outcomes Survey

You can use a pen or pencil.

Like this: ☐ Not like this: ☒ ☒ ☒

Postsecondary School Section

1. At any time since leaving high school, **have you ever** attended any school, job training, or education program?

(Please FILL IN ONE circle)

☐ No (Go to question 4)

☒ Yes (Go to question 2)

2. Did you complete an entire term?

(Please FILL IN ONE circle)

☐ No

☒ Yes

3. Describe the kind of school or job training program you attended.

(Please FILL IN ALL circles that apply)

- ☐ High school completion document or certificate (Adult Basic Education, GED)
- ☒ Short-term education or employment training program (Job Corps, Michigan Works, Summer Employment Program, etc.)
- ☐ Vocational Technical School – less than 2-year degree program
- ☐ Community or Technical College to obtain a 2 year degree
- ☐ College or University to earn a 4 or more year degree
- ☐ On a mission, in the Peace Corps, VISTA, etc.
- ☐ Enrolled in studies while incarcerated in jail or prison
- ☐ Other (please specify): _____

Employment Section

4. At any time since leaving high school, **have you ever** worked?

(Please FILL IN ONE circle)

☐ No (Go to question 9)

☒ Yes (Go to question 5)

OVER →

5. Since leaving high school, have you worked at any time for a total of 3 months (about 90 days)?
- ☐ No

(Please FILL IN **ONE** circle)

☒ Yes

6. Think about your most recent job. Did you work on average 20 or more hours per week (or about half time of a 40-hour week)?
- ☐ No

(Please FILL IN **ONE** circle)

☒ Yes

7. Again, thinking about your most recent job, were you paid at least minimum wage (\$7.40 an hour if you are age 18 or older; \$7.25 an hour if you are age 17 or younger; or \$2.65 an hour if you worked in a job where you earned regular tips such as waitstaff in a restaurant)?
- ☐ No

(Please FILL IN **ONE** circle)

☒ Yes

8. Where was your most recent job?

(Please FILL IN **ONE** circle)

☐ In a company, business, or service with people with and without disabilities

☒ In the military

☐ In supported employment (paid work with services and wage support to the employer)

☐ Self-employed

☐ In your family's business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering)

☐ In sheltered employment (where most workers have disabilities)

☐ Employed while in jail or prison

☐ Other (please specify): _____

9. What is your relationship to the former student in question?

(Please FILL IN **ONE** circle)

☐ I am the former student

☒ I am a parent, guardian, or caregiver of the former student

☐ Other (please specify): _____

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.

Please return it to us in the self-addressed envelope or to:

Dr. Lyke Thompson, Post-School Survey
Wayne State University/Center for Urban Studies
5700 Cass Avenue, 2207 A/AB
Detroit MI 48202